

Fiscal Year 2006 Appropriation

Analysis, Bills, and Reports

Annual Planning and Budget Division, July 2005

FY 2006 APPROPRIATIONS BILLS AND REPORTS
Table of Contents

ITEM

Section I — Analysis and Reporting Requirements

- Tab A. Analysis of Action on FY 2006 Appropriations
- Tab B. FY 2006 Reporting Requirements
- Tab C. FY 2006 Congressional Directives

Section II — Public Law and Committee Reports

- Tab A. Public Law 109-54
- Tab B. House Committee Report 109-80
- Tab C. Senate Committee Report 109-80
- Tab D. Conference Committee Report 109-188

Section III — House and Senate Versions of the Bills

- Tab A. H.R. 2361, as passed by the House on May 19, 2005
- Tab B. H.R. 2361 as passed by the Senate on June 22, 2005

Section IV — Floor Consideration

- Tab A. Selected Amendments Proposed on the House Floor
- Tab B. Selected Amendments Proposed on the Senate Floor
- Tab C. Highlights from Debate on the Conference Report

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<i>Science and Technology</i>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
<hr/>					
Air toxics and quality – H. 94 S. 55 C. 100	93,898.0	-7,000.0	-5,750.0	-7,619.0	86,279.0
	[HOUSE] For the air toxics program.				
Clean air allowance trading program	9,353.0	0.0	-619.0	-619.0	8,734.0
Federal support for air quality management	10,016.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,016.0
Federal support for air toxics program	2,265.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,265.0
Federal vehicle and fuels standards/certification	66,567.0	-7,000.0	-5,131.0	-7,000.0	59,567.0
Radiation: Protection	2,121.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,121.0
Radiation: Response preparedness	3,576.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,576.0
<hr/>					
Climate Protection Program – H. 94 S. 55 C. 100	17,732.0	2,300.0	2,300.0	1,300.0	19,032.0
	[HOUSE] For the climate protection program. EPA is encouraged to increase its use of private sector capability in the clean automotive technology program. The increase provided for the climate protection program is to ensure that not less than \$10,000,000 is used for competitively awarded contract research and engineering services and activities. The private sector has significant research capability that is used by EPA through this program, to develop clean, cost effective, highly fuelefficient engines and powertrain technologies.				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Climate protection program	17,732.0	2,300.0	2,300.0	1,300.0	19,032.0
<hr/>					
Congressional Priorities - S&T – H. 94 S. 55 C. 100	0.0	40,000.0	21,775.0	33,275.0	33,275.0
	<p>[HOUSE] An increase of \$40,000,000 for programs of national and regional significance that have been funded through this program/project in at least 3 of the last 4 years. ... The Committee has included \$40,000,000 for Programs of National and Regional Significance with the expectation that the EPA will conduct a competitive solicitation among programs that have been added by the Congress to the Science and Technology account in at least 3 of the last 4 years. The Committee notes that many of these Congressional priorities provide invaluable assistance to the EPA and are performed at a cost substantially less than if EPA were to institute such programs inhouse. A competitive solicitation should ensure that the highest priority national and regional programs continue to be funded. [CONFERENCE] The conference agreement provides a total of \$33,275,000 for high priority projects, a decrease of \$6,725,000 below the House recommended level. The managers have not agreed to a competitive solicitation this year for these programs. This issue may be revisited in future years. The managers agree to the following distribution of funds</p>				
Aiken Greening at the University of Vermont	0.0	0.0	400.0	400.0	400.0
Alfred University Center for Environmental and Energy Research	0.0	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0
American Water Works Association Research Foundation	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
Baylor University	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	200.0
	<p>[SENATE] A comprehensive assessment of Lake Whitney [CONFERENCE] Comprehensive assessment of Lake Whitney</p>				
Boise State University	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] To continue research on multi-purpose sensors to detect and analyze contaminants and time-lapse imaging of shallow subsurface fluid flow		
Center for Air Toxic Metals, EERC at the University of North Dakota	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
Center for the Study of Metals in the Environment at the University of Delaware	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
Central California Ozone Study, San Joaquin Valleywide Air Pollution Study Agency	0.0	0.0	375.0	375.0	375.0
Clean Air Counts program emission reduction partnership with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
Environmental Systems Center of Excellence at Syracuse Univ., NY Indoor Environment Quality	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
FL Dept. of Citrus Abscission Chemical Studies	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
Greater Houston Partnership/Houston Advanced Research Center	0.0	0.0	250.0	0.0	0.0
			[SENATE] Air quality study for the Greater Houston Partnership/Houston Advanced Research Center		

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Irrigation Training and Research Center--Cal Poly., San Luis Obispo Flow Rate Measurement	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,200.0	1,200.0
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
			[SENATE] Louisiana Smart Growth program in the State of Louisiana	[CONFERENCE] Louisiana Smart Growth program in the State of Louisiana	
Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxic Research Center	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
Missouri River Institute at the University of South Dakota	0.0	0.0	400.0	400.0	400.0
National Alternative Fuels Training Consortium at West Virginia University	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
National Environmental Respiratory Center [NERC] at the Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute in Albuquerque, New Mexico	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center	0.0	0.0	2,100.0	2,100.0	2,100.0
			[SENATE] Mine Waste Technology program at the National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center	[CONFERENCE] Mine Waste Technology program at the National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center	
New England Green Chemistry Consortium	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
Ohio State University Olentangy River Wetlands Park Teaching, Research, and Outreach Initiative	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Ohio University Consortium for Energy, Economics, and the Environment	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
Proctor Maple Research Station in Underhill, Vermont	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	200.0
Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
Stephen F. Austin State University	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	200.0
			[SENATE] Poultry science project [CONFERENCE] Poultry science project at Stephen F. Austin State University		
Texas Air Quality Study 2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research	0.0	0.0	0.0	400.0	400.0
Texas State University System Geography and Geology Project	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
Texas Tech University	0.0	0.0	450.0	450.0	450.0
			[SENATE] An environmental program at the Water Policy Institute [CONFERENCE] Environmental program at the Water Policy Institute		
UNC Charlotte VisualGRID	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
University of Louisville Lung Biology/Translational Lung Disease Program	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0	1,500.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
University of Memphis Groundwater Institute	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] To conduct a groundwater study				
University of South Alabama Center for Estuarine Research	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
University of Tennessee at Knoxville Natural Resources Policy Center	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
Water Environment Research Foundation	0.0	0.0	2,600.0	3,000.0	3,000.0
Water Systems Council Wellcare Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Paper industry byproduct waste reduction research in Wisconsin				
Enforcement – H. 94 S. 55 C. 148	13,737.0	-12,364.0	0.0	0.0	13,737.0
Forensics support	13,737.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13,737.0
Homeland Security – H. 94 S. 55 C. 148	93,785.0	-43,000.0	-54,190.0	-43,000.0	50,785.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$35,000,000 for Water Sentinel and related training, and a decrease of \$8,000,000 in preparedness, response, and recovery for the decontamination program. While the amount provided is less than the budget request, there is an increase above the fiscal year 2005 level for these programs. ... The EPA should develop clear goals				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Water sentinel and related training	44,000.0	-35,000.0	-38,415.0	-35,000.0	9,000.0
<hr/>					
Indoor Air – H. 94 S. 55 C. 148	1,274.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,274.0
Radon program	442.0	0.0	-442.0	0.0	442.0
Reduce risks from indoor air	832.0	0.0	-832.0	0.0	832.0
Schools and workplace program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<hr/>					
IT/Data Management – H. 94 S. 55	4,251.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,251.0
<hr/>					
Operations and Administration – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	8,716.0	0.0	-250.0	0.0	8,716.0
	[CONFERENCE] The managers do not agree with the transfer of research funds to other offices. In addition to the offices mentioned in House Report 109-80, this direction applies to the Office of the Administrator, which was inadvertently omitted from the House report.				
Facilities infrastructure and operations	8,716.0	0.0	-250.0	0.0	8,716.0
<hr/>					
Pesticide Licensing – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	4,966.0	30.0	30.0	0.0	4,966.0
Registration of new pesticides	2,490.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,490.0
	8 of 91	<i>Science and Technology</i>			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Review/reregistration of existing pesticides	2,506.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,506.0
<hr/>					
Research: Clean Air – H. 94 S. 55 C. 101	108,372.0	0.0	-7,004.0	-2,600.0	105,772.0
Air toxics	16,387.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16,387.0
Global change	20,534.0	0.0	-956.0	-600.0	19,934.0
National ambient air quality standards	71,451.0	0.0	-6,048.0	-2,000.0	69,451.0
<hr/>					
Research: Clean Water – H. 94 S. 55 C. 101	101,590.0	0.0	-9,308.0	-4,800.0	96,790.0
Drinking water	45,690.0	0.0	270.0	0.0	45,690.0
Water quality	55,900.0	0.0	-9,308.0	-4,800.0	51,100.0
<hr/>					
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	236,736.0	12,400.0	1,288.0	6,826.0	243,562.0

[HOUSE] A decrease of \$1,200,000 for computational toxicology and increases of \$1,900,000 for endocrine disruptor research, \$3,700,000 for fellowships through the Science to Achieve Results program, and \$8,000,000 for other human health and ecosystems research of which \$4,000,000 is for exploratory grants, \$2,900,000 is for ecosystem protection research, \$600,000 is for aggregate risk research, and \$500,000 is for condition assessments of estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico. [CONFERENCE] In research: human health and ecosystems, there is an

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
	increase of \$15,000 for fellowships and decreases of \$213,000 for endocrine disruptor research and \$5,376,000 for other research, which includes decreases of \$2,000,000 for exploratory grants, \$600,000 for aggregate risks, \$500,000 for condition assessments of estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico, and \$2,276,000 for a general program reduction, which should be applied after consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.				
Computational toxicology	13,832.0	-1,200.0	-1,838.0	-1,200.0	12,632.0
Decrease: aggregate risks	0.0	0.0	0.0	-600.0	-600.0
Decrease: condition assessments of estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	-500.0	-500.0
Decrease: exploratory grants	0.0	0.0	0.0	-2,000.0	-2,000.0
Decrease: General Reudction	0.0	0.0	0.0	-2,276.0	-2,276.0
Endocrine disruptor	8,705.0	1,900.0	1,687.0	1,687.0	10,392.0
Fellowships	8,327.0	3,700.0	3,715.0	3,715.0	12,042.0
Human health and ecosystems	8,327.0	3,700.0	-2,276.0	163,929.0	172,256.0
Human health risk assessment	36,240.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36,240.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Human health risk assessment: by transfer from Hazardous substance superfund	-4,022.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-4,022.0
<hr/>					
Research: Land Protection – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	13,696.0	0.0	-4,631.0	-2,300.0	11,396.0
By transfer from hazardous substance superfund	-23,099.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-23,099.0
By transfer from hazardous substance superfund	-1,485.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1,485.0
Lane protection and restoration	13,696.0	0.0	-4,631.0	-2,300.0	11,396.0
<hr/>					
Research: Sustainability – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	29,036.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29,036.0
Economics and decision science	2,645.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,645.0
Environmental technology verification (ETV)	3,203.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,203.0
Sustainability (other activities)	23,188.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23,188.0
<hr/>					
Toxic Research and Prevention – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	29,753.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29,753.0
Pesticides and toxics	29,753.0	-29,753.0	0.0	0.0	29,753.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Water: Human Health Protection – H. 94 S. 55 C. 149	3,068.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,068.0
Drinking water programs	3,068.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,068.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<u>Environmental Programs and Management</u>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
<hr/>					
Air Toxics and Quality – H. 104 C. 101	209,935.0	-6,800.0	-28,651.0	-18,956.0	190,979.0
	<p>[HOUSE] A net decrease of \$6,800,000 for air toxics and quality, including a decrease of \$5,000,000 in Federal support for air quality management for the clean diesel initiative, an increase of \$1,200,000 for stratospheric ozone/domestic programs, and a decrease of \$3,000,000 for stratospheric ozone/multilateral fund. ... The pesticide Safety Education Program should be funded at \$1,200,000 in fiscal year 2006. ... EPA has adopted regulations to reduce emissions from onroad heavyduty diesel vehicles beginning in 2007 and from offroad heavyduty diesel vehicles beginning in 2010. These regulations will apply to new vehicles and not to the millions of existing vehicles, which will probably not be fully replaced until 2030. Through the clean diesel initiative, EPA is working to retrofit existing vehicles with new emission reduction technologies. These include the accelerated use of new fuels, aftertreatment of diesel exhaust with retrofit technology, and replacing and rebuilding older engines with new cleaner engine technology. The Committee has provided \$10,000,000 in support of these efforts. [CONFERENCE] In Federal support for air quality management, there are decreases of \$5,000,000 for the clean diesel initiative and \$5,000,000 for other program activities. Other decreases include \$400,000 for radiation protection programs, \$156,000 for stratospheric ozone domestic programs, and \$1,600,000 for stratospheric ozone multilateral programs.</p>				
Clean air allowance trading programs	18,234.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18,234.0
Decrease: Clean Diesel Initiative	0.0	0.0	0.0	-5,000.0	-5,000.0
Decrease: Other program activities	0.0	0.0	0.0	-5,000.0	-5,000.0
Federal stationary source regulations	23,509.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23,509.0
	13 of 91	<i>Environmental Programs and Management</i>			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Federal support for air quality management (except clean diesel)	95,891.0	0.0	-7,699.0	-5,000.0	90,891.0
Federal support for air quality management: clean diesel initiative	15,000.0	-5,000.0	-15,000.0	-10,000.0	5,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] A total of \$5,000,000 is provided for the clean diesel initiative as described in House Report 109-80.				
Federal support for air toxics program	25,431.0	0.0	-841.0	0.0	25,431.0
Radiation: Protection	11,765.0	0.0	-643.0	-400.0	11,365.0
Radiation: Response preparedness	2,636.0	0.0	-12.0	0.0	2,636.0
Stratospheric ozone: Domestic programs	3,969.0	1,200.0	1,044.0	1,044.0	5,013.0
	[CONFERENCE] Within stratospheric ozone domestic programs, the Sunwise program should be continued at the fiscal year 2005 funding level.				
Stratospheric ozone: Multilateral fund	13,500.0	-3,000.0	-5,500.0	-4,600.0	8,900.0
Brownfields – H. 104 C. 102	29,638.0	-5,000.0	-4,638.0	-4,638.0	25,000.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$5,000,000 for Brownfields support. [CONFERENCE] There is an increase of \$362,000 for brownfields support.				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Climate Protection Program – H. 104 C. 102	95,530.0	-4,000.0	-1,000.0	-2,000.0	93,530.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$4,000,000 for climate protection, including decreases of \$500,000 for Energy Star and \$3,500,000 for the methane to markets initiative. [CONFERENCE] In climate protection, there are increases of \$500,000 for the energy star program and \$1,500,000 for the methane to markets program.				
Climate protection program (other activities)	41,030.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41,030.0
Energy star	50,500.0	-500.0	0.0	0.0	50,500.0
Methane to markets	4,000.0	-3,500.0	-1,000.0	-2,000.0	2,000.0
Compliance – H. 104 C. 102	132,131.0	-2,900.0	-6,084.0	-6,084.0	126,047.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$2,900,000 for compliance monitoring, including decreases of \$1,800,000 to reduce the rescissionrelated restoration proposed in the budget and \$1,100,000 for regional program support. [CONFERENCE] There is a decrease of \$3,184,000 for compliance monitoring.				
Compliance assistance and centers	29,097.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29,097.0
Compliance incentives	9,622.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9,622.0
Compliance monitoring	93,412.0	-2,900.0	-6,084.0	-6,084.0	87,328.0
Congressional Priorities - EPM – H. 104 C. 102	0.0	40,000.0	37,605.0	50,543.0	50,543.0
	[HOUSE] An increase of \$40,000,000 for programs of national and regional significance that have been funded through this				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
					<p>program/project in at least 3 of the last 4 years. The Committee notes that the National Rural Water Association program has been moved to the Water: Health Protection/Drinking Water Programs portion of the environmental programs and management account. ... The Committee has included \$40,000,000 for Programs of National and Regional Significance with the expectation that the EPA will conduct a competitive solicitation among special programs that have been added by the Congress to the Environmental Programs and Management account in at least 3 of the last 4 years. The Committee notes that many of these Congressional priorities provide invaluable assistance to the EPA and are performed at a cost substantially less than if EPA were to institute such programs in house. A competitive solicitation should ensure that the highest priority national and regional programs continue to be funded. [CONFERENCE] The conference agreement provides a total of \$50,543,000 for high priority projects, an increase of \$10,543,000 above the House recommended level. The managers have not agreed to a competitive solicitation this year for these programs. This issue may be revisited in future years. The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:</p>
Alabama Department of Environmental Management	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
America's Clean Water Foundation	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	3,000.0	3,000.0
Anacostia River Tidal Wetlands Project (MD)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
Canaan Valley Institute, WV	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
Crow's Neck Environmental Education Center	0.0	0.0	130.0	130.0	130.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
East Providence, Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
EPA Region 10 environmental compliance	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
Grambling University in Louisiana	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	200.0
Greenwood Lake, New Jersey	0.0	0.0	300.0	300.0	300.0
Groundwater Protection Council	0.0	0.0	650.0	650.0	650.0
Hawaii Island Economic Development Board	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
Highland Learning Center (CA)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,750.0	1,750.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0	0.0	938.0	938.0
Lake Champlain, Vermont	0.0	0.0	775.0	775.0	775.0
Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Lincoln County, Montana			[SENATE] lake restoration in Louisiana		
	0.0	0.0		1,000.0	1,000.0
Long Island Sound restoration			[SENATE] An air quality improvement program [CONFERENCE] Air quality improvement program in Lincoln County, Montana		
	0.0	0.0		1,800.0	1,800.0
Mohawk Valley, New York Water Authority	0.0	0.0		250.0	250.0
National Assoc. of Development Organizations			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Mohawk Valley, New York Water Authority's bacteria detection program		
	0.0	0.0		500.0	500.0
National Biosolids Partnership			[CONFERENCE] National Assoc. of Development Organizations Training and Information Dissemination Related to Rural Brownfields, Air Quality Standards, and Water Infrastructure		
	0.0	0.0		1,000.0	1,000.0
National Rural Water Association	0.0	0.0		11,000.0	11,000.0
New Bedford, Massachusetts			[SENATE] Including source water protection programs [CONFERENCE] National Rural Water Association, including source water protection programs		
	0.0	0.0		500.0	500.0
New Haven, CT			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Environmental and science education program in New Bedford, Massachusetts		
	0.0	0.0		500.0	500.0
Northwest Straits Commission			[CONFERENCE] Wastewater turbine technology project for the City of New Haven, Connecticut		
	0.0	0.0		250.0	250.0
			[SENATE] Washington State University beach watchers marine resources program		

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Ohio River Pollutant Reduction Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
Omaha, Nebraska	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
Onondaga and Cayuga Counties, NY	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
Ozarks Environmental and Water Resources Institute at Southwest Missouri State University	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer study	0.0	0.0	300.0	300.0	300.0
Rural Community Assistance Program	0.0	0.0	3,000.0	3,500.0	3,500.0
Small Public Water System Technology Centers	0.0	0.0	4,000.0	4,000.0	4,000.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Walker Lake	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
Research and Community Health [PERCH] program					
Water Systems Council Wellcare Program	0.0	0.0	750.0	0.0	0.0
[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Walker Lake, Nevada Working Group's lake restoration program					
Waterbury, Connecticut	0.0	0.0	500.0	0.0	0.0
[SENATE] A brownfields remediation project in the City of Waterbury, Connecticut					
Enforcement – H. 105 C. 102	173,707.0	-4,000.0	2,704.0	1,803.0	175,510.0
[HOUSE] A decrease of \$4,000,000 for enforcement, including decreases of \$3,000,000 for civil enforcement and \$1,000,000 for criminal enforcement. (104) ... A total of \$24,446,000 is included for the National Estuary Program, which includes \$500,000 for each of the 28 NEP estuaries and \$10,446,000 for other activities in support of the program. [CONFERENCE] In enforcement, there are increases of \$1,500,000 for civil enforcement, \$1,900,000 for criminal enforcement, and \$500,000 for enforcement training.					
Civil enforcement	117,462.0	-3,000.0	0.0	-1,500.0	115,962.0
Criminal enforcement	37,326.0	-1,000.0	1,775.0	900.0	38,226.0
Enforcement training	2,499.0	0.0	929.0	500.0	2,999.0
Environmental justice	3,980.0	0.0	0.0	1,903.0	5,883.0
NEPA implementation	12,440.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12,440.0

	21 of 91			<i>Environmental Programs and Management</i>	

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Geographic Programs – H. 106 C. 103	70,213.0	-2,532.0	-944.0	99.0	70,312.0
	<p>[HOUSE] A net decrease of \$2,532,000 for geographic programs, including increases of \$1,045,000 for Lake Champlain, \$1,523,000 for Long Island Sound, and \$2,000,000 for Puget Sound, and decreases of \$6,000,000 for community action for a renewed environment and \$1,100,000 for regional geographic initiatives. ... The EPA needs to develop a clear plan for the Great Lakes Legacy Act implementation and explain in future budget requests how the requested funding for that program supports the plan. [SENATE] The Committee recommends a \$3,349,000 decrease below the request for Geographic program: Other. The Committee did not allocate increased funding for the CARE initiative in this program. The Committee further recommends a \$1,167,000 increase for Lake Pontchartrain above the request. [CONFERENCE] In geographic programs, there are increases of \$2,000,000 for the Chesapeake Bay program, \$532,000 for the Gulf of Mexico program, and \$1,167,000 in other activities for Lake Pontchartrain, and decreases of \$45,000 for the Lake Champlain program and \$1,523,000 for the Long Island Sound program.</p>				
Chesapeake Bay	20,746.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	22,746.0
Chesapeake Bay small watershed grants	0.0	0.0	2,254.0	0.0	0.0
	<p>[SENATE] The Committee recommends a \$2,254,000 increase above the request for the Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay. The Committee further recommends that the increased funding in this program is allocated for Chesapeake Bay small watershed grants.</p>				
Great Lakes	21,519.0	0.0	481.0	0.0	21,519.0
Gulf of Mexico	4,468.0	0.0	532.0	532.0	5,000.0
Lake Champlain	955.0	1,045.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,955.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Long Island Sound	477.0	1,523.0	0.0	0.0	477.0
Other: Community action for a renewed environment (CARE)	9,000.0	-6,000.0	-9,000.0	-6,000.0	3,000.0
Other: Other activities	4,186.0	0.0	5,651.0	1,167.0	5,353.0
Puget Sound	0.0	2,000.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] A total of \$2,000,000 is provided for the Puget Sound geographic program under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. This program is to be administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.				
Regional geographic initiatives	8,862.0	-1,100.0	-1,862.0	-1,100.0	7,762.0
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>					
Homeland Security – H. 104 C. 103	23,378.0	0.0	-1,930.0	0.0	23,378.0
Communication and information (other activities)	5,450.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5,450.0
Communication and information: Laboratory preparedness and response	1,230.0	0.0	-1,230.0	0.0	1,230.0
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination)	6,747.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6,747.0
Critical infrastructure protection: Decontamination	100.0	0.0	-100.0	0.0	100.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Preparedness, response, and recovery: Decontamination	3,448.0	0.0	-600.0	0.0	3,448.0
Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure	6,403.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6,403.0
<hr/>					
Indoor air – H. 104 C. 103	29,414.0	0.0	-2,220.0	-400.0	29,014.0
	[CONFERENCE] In indoor air, there is a decrease of \$400,000 for radon programs.				
Radon program	5,918.0	0.0	-918.0	-400.0	5,518.0
Reduce risks from indoor air	23,496.0	0.0	-1,302.0	0.0	23,496.0
	[CONFERENCE] Within indoor air programs, \$2,000,000 should be used to continue environmental tobacco-related programs. The managers note that, after this set-aside, there is still an increase for asthma programs above the fiscal year 2005 level.				
<hr/>					
Information exchange / Outreach – H. 104 C. 103	123,772.0	5,000.0	-966.0	4,600.0	128,372.0
	[HOUSE] A net increase of \$5,000,000 for information exchange/outreach, including an increase of \$9,000,000 for environmental education and a decrease of \$4,000,000 for the exchange network. [CONFERENCE] In information exchange/outreach, there is a decrease of \$400,000 for State and local prevention and preparedness programs.				
Children and other sensitive populations: agency coordination	6,890.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6,890.0
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations	49,753.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	49,753.0
Environmental education	0.0	9,000.0	7,000.0	9,000.0	9,000.0
Exchange network	22,739.0	-4,000.0	-4,739.0	-4,000.0	18,739.0
	24 of 91	<i>Environmental Programs and Management</i>			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Small business ombudsman	3,911.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,911.0
Small minority business assistance	2,348.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,348.0
State and local prevention and preparedness	12,328.0	0.0	-473.0	-400.0	11,928.0
Toxics release inventory (TRI) / Right to know	14,754.0	0.0	-2,754.0	0.0	14,754.0
Tribal - Capacity building	11,049.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11,049.0
International programs – H. 94 C. 103	21,228.0	0.0	-2,629.0	-1,250.0	19,978.0
	[CONFERENCE] In international programs, there are decreases of \$250,000 for international capacity building and \$1,000,000 for the persistent organic pollutants program.				
Commission for environmental cooperation	4,210.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,210.0
Environment and trade	1,787.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,787.0
International capacity building	6,450.0	0.0	-1,450.0	-250.0	6,200.0
Persistent organic pollutants (PDPs) implementation	2,806.0	0.0	-1,179.0	-1,000.0	1,806.0
U.S. / Mexico border	5,975.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5,975.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<hr/>					
IT / Data Management / Security – H. 104 C. 151	109,887.0	-10,000.0	-12,999.0	-10,000.0	99,887.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$10,000,000 for information technology/data management. A large amount of funding for these activities was transferred to the compliance program in the budget request. After accounting for that transfer, the Committee's recommendation provides an increase above the fiscal year 2005 level for data system improvements.				
Information security	3,888.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,888.0
IT / Data management	105,999.0	-10,000.0	-12,999.0	-10,000.0	95,999.0
<hr/>					
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review – H. 104 C. 103	118,350.0	0.0	-6,899.0	-2,503.0	115,847.0
	[CONFERENCE] There is a decrease of \$600,000 for the regulatory innovation program.				
Administrative law	5,109.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5,109.0
Alternative dispute resolution	1,051.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,051.0
Civil rights / Title VI compliance	12,530.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12,530.0
Legal advice: Environmental program	36,314.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36,314.0
Legal advice: Support program	13,088.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13,088.0
Regional science and technology	3,643.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,643.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Regulatory innovation	25,021.0	0.0	-5,007.0	-2,503.0	22,518.0
Regulatory/Economic-management and analysis	16,713.0	0.0	-1,892.0	0.0	16,713.0
Science advisory board	4,881.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,881.0
<hr/>					
Offsetting receipts from toxics and pesticides fees – H. 105	-50,000.0	50,000.0	50,000.0	50,000.0	0.0
	<p>[HOUSE] The Administration proposed a \$50,000,000 reduction to the environmental programs and management account under the assumption that legislation would be enacted to increase fees on pesticide registrations and that \$50,000,000 would be made available, as a result, to offset appropriations. The Committee notes that no legislative proposal has been received from the Administration and it is unlikely that these receipts will be available for fiscal year 2006 as explained below. Therefore, the Committee recommends an increase of \$50,000,000 to ensure that critical programs in this area continue. The Committee believes that the budget should not assume the use of receipts that are dependent on the enactment of subsequent legislation unless such legislation is under active consideration by the Congress.</p>				
<hr/>					
Operations and administration – H. 104 C. 151	512,679.0	-5,000.0	-19,918.0	-5,000.0	507,679.0
	<p>[HOUSE] A decrease of \$5,000,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations.</p>				
Acquisition management	23,055.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23,055.0
Central planning, budgeting, and finance	72,790.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	72,790.0
Facilities, infrastructure, and operations	358,046.0	-5,000.0	-18,046.0	-5,000.0	353,046.0
	27 of 91	Environmental Programs and Management			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements management	19,916.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19,916.0
Human Resources Management	38,872.0	0.0	-1,872.0	0.0	38,872.0
Pesticide licensing – H. 106 C. 103	125,897.0	-3,041.0	-111.0	0.0	125,897.0
	<p>[HOUSE] A decrease of \$3,041,000 for pesticides: review/reregistration of existing pesticides, which leaves an increase of \$3,635,000 above the enacted level. ... When Congress enacted the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) of 2003 to allow EPA to collect new pesticide registration fees, it specifically prohibited the collection of any new tolerance fees by the EPA. However, the Administration assumed the use of receipts from registration fees as part of its fiscal year 2005 and 2006 budget requests. EPA should not spend time proposing fees and promulgating rules in conflict with PRIA and should use its limited resources on other, more productive pesticide work.</p> <p>[CONFERENCE] In pesticide licensing, there is an increase of \$3,041,000 for review/reregistration of existing pesticides.</p>				
Field programs	24,683.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24,683.0
Registration of new pesticides	41,472.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41,472.0
Review/reregistration of existing pesticides	57,991.0	-3,041.0	0.0	0.0	57,991.0
Science policy and biotechnology	1,751.0	0.0	-111.0	0.0	1,751.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) – H. 105 C. 152	125,814.0	-5,000.0	0.0	-5,500.0	120,314.0
	[HOUSE] A general reduction of \$5,000,000 for RCRA activities. The Committee notes that, after this reduction, the Agency will retain an increase of nearly \$3,000,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level. The increase above the enacted level should be used for the highest priority activities.				
Corrective action	42,710.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42,710.0
General reduction	0.0	-5,000.0	0.0	-5,000.0	-5,000.0
Waste management	68,728.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	68,728.0
Waste minimization and recycling	14,376.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14,376.0
Toxics risk review and prevention – H. 105 C. 103	93,217.0	-1,000.0	-2,226.0	-1,226.0	91,991.0
	[HOUSE] A net decrease of \$1,000,000 for toxics risk review and prevention, including an increase of \$1,000,000 for chemical risk review and a decrease of \$2,000,000 for the pollution prevention program. [CONFERENCE] In the toxics risk review and prevention program, there is an increase of \$1,356,000 for the high production volume challenge and high production volume information system and a decrease of \$1,582,000 for the pollution prevention program.				
Endocrine disruptors	9,097.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9,097.0
Increase: high production volume challenge	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,356.0	1,356.0
Pollution prevention program	19,990.0	-2,000.0	-3,582.0	-3,582.0	16,408.0
	29 of 91	<i>Environmental Programs and Management</i>			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Toxic substances: Chemical risk management	9,058.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9,058.0
Toxic substances: Chemical risk review & reduction	44,523.0	0.0	1,356.0	2,356.0	46,879.0
			[SENATE] The Committee recommends a \$1,356,000 increase above the request for Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction. The Committee further recommends in this program that the \$1,356,000 increase is allocated to the High Production Volume Chemical Challenge Program and the High Production Volume Information System.		
Toxic substances: Lead risk reduction program	10,549.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,549.0
<hr/>					
Underground storage tanks – H. 104	7,719.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7,719.0
<hr/>					
Water quality protection – H. 106 C. 103	207,080.0	-194,801.0	-4,801.0	-2,000.0	205,080.0
			[HOUSE] The Committee is aware that the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma has applied for treatment as a State status under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the ‘‘Clean Water Act’’) and that the issue is currently under litigation. The Committee will watch with interest the resolution of this issue. ... The Committee is aware of TCE contamination affecting a large number of homes in Endicott and Ithaca, NY, which is due to vapor intrusion of TCE contaminants into the basements of homes. The Committee is further aware that EPA is in the process of finalizing its TCE risk assessment and that this is a process that is likely to continue over the next two years or more. EPA has indicated that it is currently evaluating a number of interim approaches for screening levels for TCE while awaiting the final assessment. The Committee strongly urges EPA to work with the State of New York to adopt protective interim approaches, as soon as practicable, including consideration of provisional screening levels based upon the 2001 Human Health Risk		

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
	Assessment. Finally, the Committee expects EPA to keep it informed periodically on progress on the development and implementation of interim procedures and actions at these sites and on completion of the new EPA risk assessment. [CONFERENCE] There is a decrease of \$2,000,000 for the water quality monitoring program.				
Marine pollution	12,279.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12,279.0
Surface water protection (other activities)	185,501.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	185,501.0
Surface water protection: Water quality monitoring	9,300.0	0.0	-4,801.0	-2,000.0	7,300.0
Water: Ecosystems – H. 105 C. 103	89,821.0	-17,000.0	-18,446.0	-15,000.0	74,821.0
	[HOUSE] A net decrease of \$17,000,000 for water/ecosystems, including a decrease of \$22,000,000 for Great Lakes Legacy Act programs (which leaves an increase of 25 percent above the fiscal year 2005 level) and an increase of \$5,000,000 for the National Estuary Program. ... The Committee expects EPA to encourage local governments and communities to pursue innovative publicprivate partnerships, such as the AdoptAWaterway program, which, at no additional cost to the taxpayers, help to implement storm water pollution prevention activities, curb urban runoff, and improve water quality. Further, the Committee encourages EPA to work with the States to enter into public-private partnerships, such as AdoptAWaterway, to fulfill their public education and outreach responsibilities. [CONFERENCE] There is an increase of \$2,000,000 for Great Lakes Legacy Act programs.				
Great Lakes Legacy Act	50,000.0	-22,000.0	-20,000.0	-20,000.0	30,000.0
National estuary program / Coastal waterways	19,446.0	5,000.0	1,554.0	5,000.0	24,446.0
Wetlands	20,375.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20,375.0
	31 of 91	Environmental Programs and Management			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Water: Human health protection – H. 105 C. 103	104,354.0	7,000.0	-6,090.0	-4,500.0	99,854.0
	[HOUSE] A net increase of \$7,000,000 for water/human health protection, including a decrease of \$3,000,000 for drinking water programs and an increase of \$10,000,000 for the National Rural Water Association. [CONFERENCE] There are decreases of \$1,500,000 for drinking water programs and \$10,000,000 for the National Rural Water Association, which is funded under the environmental protection/Congressional priorities activity detailed above.				
Beach/fish programs	3,264.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,264.0
Drinking water programs	101,090.0	-3,000.0	-6,090.0	-4,500.0	96,590.0
National Rural Water Association	0.0	10,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<u>Office of Inspector General</u>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations – H. 109 S. 61					
	36,955.0	1,000.0	0.0	500.0	37,455.0
	<p>[HOUSE] An increase of \$259,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level and \$1,000,000 above the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends that \$13,536,000, as requested, be transferred to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account. The Committee expects that \$1,000,000 will be used to carry out the duties of Inspector General for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. [SENATE] The Committee recommends \$36,955,000 for the Office of Inspector General, which is equal to the budget request and \$741,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level.</p>				
By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund	-13,536.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-13,536.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<u>Buildings and Facilities</u>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure – H. 109 S. 62 C. 152	11,500.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11,500.0
	[HOUSE] \$40,218,000, the budget request, for buildings and facilities, a decrease of \$1,470,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level.				
Operations and administration: Facilities infrastructure and operations – H. 109 S. 62 C. 152	28,718.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28,718.0
	[SENATE] The Committee recommends \$40,218,000 for buildings and facilities, \$1,530,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level (excluding emergency appropriations) and equal to the budget request and the House allowance.				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<u>Hazardous Substance Superfund</u>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
Air toxics and quality – H. 116 C. 104	2,387.0	0.0	-356.0	-175.0	2,212.0
	[CONFERENCE] In air toxics and quality, there is a decrease of \$175,000 for radiation protection programs.				
Radiation: Protection	2,387.0	0.0	-356.0	-175.0	2,212.0
Audits, evaluations, and investigations – H. 116 C. 153	13,536.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13,536.0
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	-13,536.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-13,536.0
Compliance – H. 116 C. 104	1,348.0	0.0	-521.0	-222.0	1,126.0
	[CONFERENCE] In compliance, there are decreases of \$11,000 for compliance assistance and centers, \$11,000 for compliance incentives, and \$200,000 for compliance monitoring.				
Compliance assistance and centers	23.0	0.0	-11.0	-11.0	12.0
Compliance incentives	168.0	0.0	-11.0	-11.0	157.0
Compliance monitoring	1,157.0	0.0	-499.0	-200.0	957.0
Enforcement – H. 116 C. 104	190,185.0	-8,000.0	-441.0	-4,800.0	185,385.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$8,000,000 for enforcement, including decreases of \$1,000,000 for criminal enforcement and \$7,000,000 for superfund enforcement. [CONFERENCE] In				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
	enforcement, there are increases of \$200,000 for civil enforcement and \$3,000,000 for Superfund enforcement.				
Civil enforcement	883.0	0.0	-441.0	0.0	883.0
Criminal enforcement	9,504.0	-1,000.0	0.0	-800.0	8,704.0
Enforcement training	614.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	614.0
Environmental justice	845.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	845.0
Forensics support	3,840.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,840.0
Superfund: Enforcement	164,258.0	-7,000.0	0.0	-4,000.0	160,258.0
Superfund: Federal facilities enforcement	10,241.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,241.0
<hr/>					
Homeland security – H. 116	50,917.0	-11,500.0	-12,465.0	-11,500.0	39,417.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$11,500,000 for homeland security: preparedness, response, and recovery, including decreases of \$2,000,000 for decontamination and \$9,500,000 for laboratory preparedness and response.				
Communication and information: Laboratory preparedness and response	300.0	0.0	-300.0	0.0	300.0
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination)	852.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	852.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Critical infrastructure protection: decontamination	200.0	0.0	-200.0	0.0	200.0
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities)	26,915.0	0.0	10,085.0	0.0	26,915.0
Preparedness, response, and recovery: Decontamination	12,550.0	-2,000.0	-12,550.0	-2,000.0	10,550.0
Preparedness, response, and recovery: Laboratory preparedness and response	9,500.0	-9,500.0	-9,500.0	-9,500.0	0.0
Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure	600.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	600.0
Transfer to science and technology	-2,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-2,000.0
<hr/>					
Information exchange / Outreach – H. 116 C. 104	1,837.0	0.0	-6.0	-6.0	1,831.0
	[CONFERENCE] There is a decrease of \$6,000 for congressional, intergovernmental, and external relations activities.				
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations	161.0	0.0	-6.0	-6.0	155.0
Exchange network	1,676.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,676.0
<hr/>					
IT / Data management / Security – H. 116 C. 104	16,522.0	-16,113.0	-3.0	-3.0	16,519.0
	[CONFERENCE] There is a decrease of \$3,000 for information security.				
Information security	409.0	0.0	-3.0	-3.0	406.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
IT / Data management	16,113.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16,113.0
<hr/>					
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review – H. 116 C. 154	1,821.0	0.0	-160.0	0.0	1,821.0
Alternative dispute resolution	985.0	0.0	-140.0	0.0	985.0
Legal advice: Environmental program	836.0	0.0	-20.0	0.0	836.0
<hr/>					
Operations and administration – H. 116 C. 104	122,907.0	-1,500.0	-9,605.0	-2,500.0	120,407.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$1,500,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations. [CONFERENCE] In operations and administration, there is a decrease of \$1,000,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations.				
Acquisition management	20,367.0	0.0	-1,479.0	0.0	20,367.0
Central planning, budgeting, and finance	22,445.0	0.0	-2,066.0	0.0	22,445.0
Facilities infrastructure and operations	72,726.0	-1,500.0	-5,646.0	-2,500.0	70,226.0
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements management	2,579.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,579.0
Human resources management	4,790.0	0.0	-414.0	0.0	4,790.0
<hr/>					
	38 of 91	<i>Hazardous Substance Superfund</i>			

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Research: Human health and ecosystems, transfer to S&T – H. 116 C. 154	4,022.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,022.0
Human health risk assessment	4,022.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,022.0
Transfer to Science and Technology	-4,022.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-4,022.0
Research: Land protection, transfer to S&T – H. 116 C. 154	23,099.0	0.0	-105.0	0.0	23,099.0
Land protection and restoration	23,099.0	0.0	-105.0	0.0	23,099.0
Transfer to Science and Technology	-23,099.0	0.0	105.0	0.0	-23,099.0
Research: Superfund innovative technology (SITE) program, transfer to S&T – H. 116 C. 154	1,485.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,485.0
Research: Superfund innovative technology (SITE) program	1,485.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,485.0
Transfer to Science and Technology	-1,485.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1,485.0
Superfund cleanup – H. 116 C. 104	849,267.0	0.0	494.0	494.0	849,761.0

[HOUSE] The Committee is aware of the Hudson River PCB Superfund site and the burdens it has placed on the Town of Fort Edward, New York, which will host the dewatering facility for site remediation. The Committee is concerned that the Town of Fort Edward does not have the capacity to alleviate the multiyear impacts of this remediation

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
	<p>without assistance. The Committee expects the EPA to provide assistance to the maximum extent possible, including financial and staffing assistance, to the Town of Fort Edward throughout the duration of this project and to maintain a close dialogue with the Town of Fort Edward and the Committee. The Committee also expects the EPA to provide semiannual reports on the Hudson River PCB Superfund project to the Committee. ... In 2001, the National Academy of Sciences issued "A Risk Management Strategy for PCB Contaminated Sediments" that noted the lack of information on the effectiveness of remedial actions at contaminated sediment sites. The report called for more evaluations of remedial efforts to determine the effectiveness of such remedies, particularly dredging, in achieving projected environmental benefits. Currently, about 140 contaminated sediment sites are in some stage of the Superfund process. A number of these sites are "mega" sites with large potential costs for both public and private parties. The Committee believes that independent experts should take another look at this issue with an emphasis on mega sites. Accordingly, the Committee expects the EPA to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to examine whether: (1) actual costs match EPA estimates; (2) EPA estimated risk reduction benefits are being achieved as predicted; (3) such risk reduction benefits will be achieved significantly faster than other less costly remedial alternatives, including source control and natural recovery; (4) EPA is considering remedial alternatives on an equal footing, or dredging is the presumptive remedy; (5) EPA is considering potential adverse consequences of all remedial alternatives consistent with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act; and (6) EPA regions are following agency sediment guidance and recommendations made by the Academy in its 2001 report. EPA should complete arrangements with the Academy for this study no later than December 1, 2005, and the study should be provided to the Committee no later than December 1, 2006. [CONFERENCE] In Superfund cleanup, there is an increase of \$494,000 for emergency response and removal.</p>				
Emergency response and removal	198,000.0	0.0	494.0	494.0	198,494.0
EPA emergency preparedness	10,507.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,507.0
	40 of 91			<i>Hazardous Substance Superfund</i>	

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Federal facilities	31,611.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31,611.0
Remedial	599,395.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	599,395.0
Support to other Federal agencies	9,754.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9,754.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<u>Leaking Underground Storage Tank Problem</u>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
Compliance: Compliance assistance and centers – H. 117 S. 64 C. 105	774.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	774.0
IT / Data Management – H. 117 S. 64 C. 105	178.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	178.0
Operations and administration – H. 117 S. 64 C. 105	2,169.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,169.0
Acquisition management	346.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	346.0
Central planning, budgeting, and finance	936.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	936.0
Facilities infrastructure and operations	884.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	884.0
Human resources management	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Research: Land protection and restoration – H. 117 S. 64 C. 105	646.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	646.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Underground storage tanks – H. 117 S. 64 C. 105	69,260.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	69,260.0
	<p>[HOUSE] The Committee recommends the budget request of \$73,027,000 for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, which is \$3,587,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request and the House allowance. The Committee directs that not less than 85 percent of these funds be provided to the States and tribal governments.</p>				
LUST Cooperative agreements	58,676.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	58,676.0
Underground storage tanks	10,584.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,584.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<i>Oil Spill Response</i>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
Compliance: Compliance assistance and centers – H. 119 S. 65 C. 105	287.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	287.0
Enforcement: Civil enforcement – H. 119 S. 65 C. 105	1,789.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,789.0
IT / Data management – H. 119 S. 65 C. 105	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0
Oil spill: Prevention, preparedness, and response – H. 119 S. 65 C. 105	12,344.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12,344.0
	[HOUSE] The Committee recommends \$15,863,000 for the oil spill response trust fund, which is \$9,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request and the House allowance.				
Operations and administration: Facilities infrastructure and operations – H. 119 S. 65 C. 105	504.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	504.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount

Research: Land protection and restoration – H. 119 S. 65 C. 105	906.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	906.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
<u>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</u>					
INTERIOR P.L.					
Air toxics and quality: Clean school bus initiative – H. 125 C. 155	10,000.0	0.0	-9,000.0	-3,000.0	7,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] In air toxics and quality programs, there is a decrease of \$3,000,000 for the clean school bus initiative.				
Brownfields projects – H. 125 C. 105	120,500.0	-25,000.0	-30,500.0	-30,500.0	90,000.0
	[HOUSE] A decrease of \$25,000,000 for Brownfields projects. The Committee recommended level represents an increase of more than \$6,000,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level. [CONFERENCE] There is a decrease of \$7,500,000 for brownfields projects.				
Categorical Grants – H. 126 C. 156	1,181,300.0	-28,000.0	-58,750.0	-1,181,300.0	0.0
	[HOUSE] A net decrease of \$28,000,000 for categorical grants, including decreases of \$8,000,000 for Brownfields, \$8,000,000 for pollution control (section 106), \$1,000,000 for pollution prevention, \$23,000,000 for a new State and tribal performance fund, and \$3,000,000 for wetlands program development and an increase of \$15,000,000 for water quality cooperative agreements. ... While no specific special project grants are identified at this point for fiscal year 2006 as in past years, targeted grants shall be accompanied by a costshare requirement whereby 45 percent of a project's cost is the responsibility of the community or entity receiving the grant. In those few cases where such costshare requirement poses a particular financial burden on the recipient community or entity, the Committee supports the Agency's use of its longstanding guidance for financial capability assessments to determine reductions or waivers from this match requirement. Except for the limited instances in which an applicant meets the criteria for a waiver, the Committee has				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
	<p>provided no more than 55% of an individual project's cost, regardless of the amount appropriated. ... The Committee has included bill language, requested by the Administration and supported by the Science Committee, permitting EPA to hire no more than 5 senior level scientists using expedited procedures. This authority is similar to that provided to the National Institutes of Health. (126) ... The Committee has, again this year, included an administrative provision giving the Administrator specific authority, in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, to award cooperative agreements to Federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia so as to properly carry out EPA's environmental programs. [CONFERENCE] In categorical grants, there are increases of \$1,000,000 for section 106 pollution control grants, \$1,856,000 for targeted watershed grants, and \$1,200,000 for wastewater operator training, and decreases of \$934,000 for hazardous waste financial assistance, \$1,772,000 for section 319 nonpoint source grants, \$5,500,000 for section 106 water quality monitoring grants, \$854,000 for public water system supervision, \$600,000 for radon, \$15,000,000 for water quality cooperative agreements, and \$1,000,000 for wetlands program development.</p>				
Beaches protection	10,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,000.0
Brownfields	60,000.0	-8,000.0	-10,000.0	-10,000.0	50,000.0
Environmental information	20,000.0	0.0	-656.0	0.0	20,000.0
Hazardous waste financial assistance	104,400.0	0.0	-934.0	-934.0	103,466.0
Homeland security	5,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5,000.0
Lead	13,700.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13,700.0
	47 of 91				<i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i>

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Nonpoint source (Sec. 319)	209,100.0	0.0	-1,772.0	-1,772.0	207,328.0
Pesticides enforcement	18,900.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18,900.0
Pesticides program implementation	13,100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13,100.0
Pollution control (Sec. 106) (other activities)	177,900.0	-8,000.0	-5,900.0	-7,000.0	170,900.0
Pollution control (Sec. 106): Water quality monitoring	54,000.0	0.0	-11,000.0	-5,500.0	48,500.0
Pollution prevention	6,000.0	-1,000.0	-1,040.0	-1,000.0	5,000.0
Public water system supervision	100,600.0	0.0	-854.0	-854.0	99,746.0
Radon	8,150.0	0.0	-1,206.0	-600.0	7,550.0
Sector program	2,250.0	0.0	-18.0	0.0	2,250.0
State and local air quality management	223,550.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	223,550.0
State and tribal performance fund	23,000.0	-23,000.0	-23,000.0	-23,000.0	0.0
Targeted watersheds	15,000.0	0.0	1,856.0	1,856.0	16,856.0

[SENATE] The Committee recommends a \$1,856,000 increase above the request for

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
	Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds. The Committee further recommends that \$6,000,000 in this program is allocated for a regional pilot program for the Chesapeake Bay that shall demonstrate effective non-point source nutrient reduction approaches that target small watersheds and accelerate nutrient reduction in innovative, sustainable, and cost-effective ways. Partners in the effort to protect the Bay include: Maryland; Pennsylvania; Virginia; the District of Columbia; the Chesapeake Bay Commission, a tri-state legislative body; EPA, which represents the Federal Government; and participating citizen advisory groups.				
Toxics substances compliance	5,150.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5,150.0
Tribal air quality management	11,050.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11,050.0
Tribal general assistance program	57,500.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	57,500.0
Underground injection control	11,000.0	0.0	-306.0	0.0	11,000.0
Underground storage tanks	11,950.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11,950.0
Wastewater operator training	0.0	0.0	1,200.0	1,200.0	1,200.0
Water quality cooperative agreements	0.0	15,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wetlands program development	20,000.0	-3,000.0	-5,120.0	0.0	20,000.0
Congressional Priorities - STAG – H. 125 C. 106	0.0	200,000.0	200,000.0	200,000.0	200,000.0

[HOUSE] An increase of \$200,000,000 for targeted STAG infrastructure grants. These

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Brush, Colorado	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	[SENATE] A wastewater treatment facility improvements project in Brush, Colorado				
	[CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment facility improvements project in Brush, Colorado				
Calhoun County, Michigan	0.0	0.0	225.0	225.0	225.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Regional wastewater treatment system improvements in Eastern Calhoun County, Michigan				
Calumet City, IL	0.0	0.0	0.0	275.0	275.0
	[CONFERENCE] Calumet City, IL Water and Sewer Improvements				
Camden, New Jersey	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] Stormwater infrastructure improvements at Farnham Park [CONFERENCE] Stormwater infrastructure improvements at Farnham Park in the City of Camden, New Jersey				
Canaan Valley, WV	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Canaan Valley, WV Canaan Valley Decentralized Wastewater System				
Canal Winchester, OH	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Canal Winchester, OH Village of Canal Winchester Water Treatment Plant Expansion				
Carnation, Washington	0.0	0.0	500.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] A sewer collection system [CONFERENCE] Carnation, WA City of Carnation Sewer Collection and Conveyance System				
Carter County, Tennessee	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Watauga River Regional Water Authority in Carter County, Tennessee				
Castleford, Idaho	0.0	0.0	400.0	400.0	400.0
	[SENATE] Water system infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Water system infrastructure improvements in the City of Castleford, Idaho				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Catherdral City, CA	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0
					[CONFERENCE] Cathedral City, CA Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements
Cayuga County, NY	0.0	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0
					[CONFERENCE] Cayuga County, NY Village of Fairhaven Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements
Cedar Grove, NC	0.0	0.0	0.0	253.0	253.0
					[CONFERENCE] Cedar Grove, NC Cedar Grove Waterline Project
Centerfield, Utah, and Mayfield, Utah	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
					[SENATE] Construction of a drinking water nitrate remediation plant [CONFERENCE] Construction of a drinking water nitrate remediation plant for Centerfield, Utah, and Mayfield, Utah
Charlotte, NC	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[CONFERENCE] Charlotte, NC Providence Road Water Line project
Cheyenne, Wyoming	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[SENATE] A wastewater treatment plant improvements project [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment plant improvements project in the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming
Citrus County, FL	0.0	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0
					[CONFERENCE] Citrus County, FL Homosassa Wastewater Collection System Project
Clark County, Washington	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
					[SENATE] A groundwater remediation project in North Clark County, Washington [CONFERENCE] Groundwater remediation project in North Clark County, Washington
Colfax, CA	0.0	0.0	0.0	600.0	600.0
					[CONFERENCE] Colfax, CA Colfax Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement
Columbia, GA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[CONFERENCE] Columbus, GA--Ox Bow Meadows Wastewater Improvements

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Columbia, Kentucky	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] Columbia, Kentucky, and the Adair County Regional Water Treatment Plant [CONFERENCE] City of Columbia, Kentucky, and the Adair County Regional Water Treatment Plant				
Coosa Valley Water Supply District	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
	[SENATE] Surface water project in Alabama [CONFERENCE] Coosa Valley Water Supply District surface water project in Alabama				
Coral Springs, FL	0.0	0.0	0.0	700.0	700.0
	[CONFERENCE] Coral Springs, FL Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Corning, NY	0.0	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0
	[CONFERENCE] Corning, NY Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Craig, Alaska	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] A water and sewer project [CONFERENCE] Water and sewer project in the City of Craig, Alaska				
Crescent City, California	0.0	0.0	375.0	375.0	375.0
	[SENATE] A wastewater treatment plant expansion in Crescent City, California [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment plant expansion in Crescent City, California				
Crosby, North Dakota	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] Water and sewer improvement projects [CONFERENCE] Water and sewer improvement projects in the City of Crosby, North Dakota				
Crow Wing County, Minnesota	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Sanitary management district of Crow Wing County, Minnesota				
Culver City, KY	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment plant expansion project in Culver City, Kentucky				
Cumberland County, Tennessee	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Cumberland, Maryland			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Lake Tansi Sewer Project in Cumberland County, Tennessee	0.0 0.0 350.0 350.0	350.0
Cumberland, Rhode Island			[SENATE] Combined sewer overflow project [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow project in the City of Cumberland, Maryland	0.0 0.0 500.0 500.0	500.0
Cumberland, Ri			[SENATE] Water infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Cumberland, RI Cumberland Drinking Water Infrastructure Improvements	0.0 0.0 0.0 500.0	500.0
Davenport, Iowa			[CONFERENCE] Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Cumberland, Rhode Island	0.0 0.0 800.0 800.0	800.0
DeSoto County, Mississippi			[SENATE] A sewer separation project [CONFERENCE] Sewer separation project in the City of Davenport, Iowa	0.0 0.0 500.0 500.0	500.0
Detroit, MI			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Regional wastewater program in DeSoto County, Mississippi	0.0 0.0 0.0 1,500.0	1,500.0
Devils Lake, North Dakota			[CONFERENCE] Detroit, MI Far Eastside Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvement Project	0.0 0.0 500.0 500.0	500.0
Douglas County, Nevada			[SENATE] Water infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Devils Lake, North Dakota	0.0 0.0 400.0 400.0	400.0
Dover-Foxcroft, Maine			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Water infrastructure improvements in Douglas County, Nevada	0.0 0.0 472.0 472.0	472.0
			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Waterline extension and water system upgrade project in the		

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Duluth, Minnesota	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	Town of Dover-Foxcroft, Maine				
Dunkirk, NY	0.0	0.0	0.0	400.0	400.0
	[SENATE] Western Lake Superior Sanitary District [CONFERENCE] Western Lake Superior Sanitary District in the City of Duluth, Minnesota				
Eagle Mountain, Utah	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Dunkirk, NY Chadwick Bay West End Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
East Central FL	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
	[SENATE] A wastewater treatment plant in Eagle Mountain, Utah [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment plant in Eagle Mountain, Utah				
East Hampton, CT	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,200.0	1,200.0
	[CONFERENCE] East Central, FL East-Central Florida Integrated Water Resources				
East Tennessee	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,550.0	1,550.0
	[CONFERENCE] East Hampton, CT Municipal Water System Improvements				
Edgewood, New Mexico	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] East Tennessee Development District Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Jefferson City 700k, Norris 300k, Cumberland Gap 250k, Jefferson County 300k)				
Elmira, Ohio, and the City of Burlington, Ohio	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system in the Town of Edgewood, New Mexico				
Emmitsburg, Maryland	0.0	0.0	150.0	150.0	150.0
	[SENATE] Wastewater collection and treatment system [CONFERENCE] Wastewater collection and treatment system in the City of Elmira, Ohio, and the City of Burlington, Ohio				
	[SENATE] Sewer line repair project [CONFERENCE] Sewer line repair project in the City				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Englewood and Littleton, Colorado	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	of Emmitsburg, Maryland				
Eureka, California	0.0	0.0	375.0	375.0	375.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment plant improvements in the Cities of Englewood and Littleton, Colorado				
Exeter, NH	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] Martin Slough interceptor project [CONFERENCE] Martin Slough interceptor project in the City of Eureka, California				
Fayetteville, Arkansas	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Exeter, NH Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Flowood, Mississippi	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] Regional wastewater treatment improvements [CONFERENCE] Regional wastewater treatment improvements for the City of Fayetteville, Arkansas				
Forrest County, Mississippi	0.0	0.0	700.0	700.0	700.0
	[SENATE] Wastewater treatment improvements [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment improvements in the City of Flowood, Mississippi				
Fresno/Arcola, TX	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
	[SENATE] A water and sewer infrastructure project in Forrest County, Mississippi				
	[CONFERENCE] Water and sewer infrastructure project in Forrest County, Mississippi				
Frostburg, Maryland	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Fresno/Arcola, TX Fort Bend County Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Funkstown, Maryland	0.0	0.0	150.0	150.0	150.0
	[SENATE] Combined sewer overflow project [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow project in the City of Frostburg, Maryland				
	[SENATE] Wastewater lagoon repair [CONFERENCE] Wastewater lagoon repair in the				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Hanover County, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	682.0	682.0
					[CONFERENCE] Hanover County, VA Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements
Hartford, CT	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
					[CONFERENCE] Hartford, CT; Springfield, Chicopee, Holyoke, Ludlow, South Hadley, MA Connecticut River Clean-up
Havre, MT	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[CONFERENCE] Havre, MT Rocky Boy's/North Central Montana Regional Water System
Haywood County, NC	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[CONFERENCE] Haywood County, NC Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Town of Clyde 500k, Canton 500k)
Heflin, AL	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	150.0
					[CONFERENCE] Heflin, AL Industrial Site Water and Sewer Project
Helena, Montana	0.0	0.0	2,250.0	2,250.0	2,250.0
					[SENATE] Water system infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Water system infrastructure improvements in the City of Helena, Montana
Henderson, Nevada	0.0	0.0	100.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[SENATE] Wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Henderson Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant [CONFERENCE] Henderson, NV Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant
Henry County, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	110.0	110.0
					[CONFERENCE] Henry County, VA Henry County Water System Connector to Pittsylvania County
Higginsport, Ohio	0.0	0.0	850.0	850.0	850.0
					[SENATE] Construction of a sewer collection and treatment system [CONFERENCE] Construction of a sewer collection and treatment system in the Village of Higginsport, Ohio
Hinckley, IL	0.0	0.0	0.0	418.0	418.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Hood Canal, WA					
Huntsville, AL					
Jacksonville Beach, FL					
Jefferson County, Colorado					
Jersey City, New Jersey					
Johnson County, Kansas					
Judge Tunnel in Park City, Utah					
Kannapolis, NC					
Keaton Beach, FL					
Kingston, PA					

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Kirtland, New Mexico			[CONFERENCE] Kingston, PA Luzerne County Combined Sewer Overflow		
	0.0	0.0		1,000.0	1,000.0
Lake Arrowhead, CA			[SENATE] Completion of Phase I of a sewer system in Kirtland, New Mexico [CONFERENCE] Construction of a wastewater treatment system in Kirtland, New Mexico		
	0.0	0.0		0.0	250.0
Lake Havasu, AZ			[CONFERENCE] Lake Arrowhead, CA Lake Arrowhead Groundwater Development		
	0.0	0.0		0.0	1,500.0
Lakota, North Dakota			[CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment plant in Lake Havasu City, Arizona		
	0.0	0.0		300.0	300.0
Lancaster, Pennsylvania			[SENATE] Wastewater treatment facility upgrades [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment facility upgrades in the City of Lakota, North Dakota		
	0.0	0.0		500.0	500.0
Las Cruces, New Mexico			[SENATE] Water infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania		
	0.0	0.0		1,000.0	1,000.0
Lee County, Virginia			[SENATE] A water project [CONFERENCE] Water project in the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico		
	0.0	0.0		500.0	500.0
Liberty Hill, TX			[SENATE] Project Alpha in Lee County, Virginia [CONFERENCE] Construction of wastewater treatment facilities expansion in Lee County, Virginia		
	0.0	0.0		0.0	365.0
Lincoln, Nebraska			[CONFERENCE] Liberty Hill, TX Liberty Hill Wastewater Treatment Facilities and Collection System		
	0.0	0.0		500.0	500.0
			[SENATE] Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Water		

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Little Rock, Arkansas	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the City of Lincoln, Nebraska				
	[SENATE] Improvements to the Little Maumelle water treatment plant [CONFERENCE] Improvements to the Little Maumelle water treatment plant in the City of Little Rock, Arkansa				
Lorena, TX	0.0	0.0	0.0	350.0	350.0
	[CONFERENCE] Lorena, TX City of Lorena Wastewater Treatment Plant				
Louisville, KY	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Louisville, KY Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy Watershed Restoration				
Machias, Maine	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment project in the Town of Machias, Maine				
Magna, Utah	0.0	0.0	700.0	700.0	700.0
	[SENATE] An arsenic and perchlorate removal project in Magna, Utah [CONFERENCE] Arsenic and perchlorate removal project in Magna, Utah				
Manchester, New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] Combined sewer overflow separation project [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow separation project in the City of Manchester, New Hampshire				
Marlette/Hobart water system in Carson City, Nevada	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
	[SENATE] Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Marlette/Hobart water system in Carson City, Nevada				
Mason City, iA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Mason City, IA Sanitary Sewer Interceptor Project				
Maui, Hawaii	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] Statewide cesspool replacement in the County of Maui and other communities,				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Mitchell County, NC	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0
	Commission treatment Plant in Missouri				
Monroe County	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Mitchell County, NC Ledger Community Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Monterey, CA	0.0	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0
	[CONFERENCE] Monterey, CA Monterey County Development and Implementation of Water Management Plan				
Moore County, NC	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Moore County, NC North West Moore Water District Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Morgan County, Indiana	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
	[SENATE] Construction of a wastewater treatment facility in the Town of Waverly and Morgan County, Indiana [CONFERENCE] Construction of a wastewater treatment facility in Morgan County, Indiana for the Town of Waverly				
Moultrie, GA	0.0	0.0	0.0	350.0	350.0
	[CONFERENCE] Moultrie, GA City of Moultrie Wastewater Treatment Plant Rehabilitation				
Mt. Pleasant, NY	0.0	0.0	0.0	138.0	138.0
	[CONFERENCE] Mt. Pleasant, NY Stormwater Infrastructure Improvements				
Muskingum County, Ohio	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	200.0
	[SENATE] A drinking water line replacement in Muskingum County, Ohio [CONFERENCE] Drinking water line replacement in Muskingum County, Ohio				
Myrtle Beach, SC	0.0	0.0	0.0	615.0	615.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Pablo/Lake County Water and Sewer District, Montana	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment improvements in the Pablo/Lake County Water and Sewer District, Montana				
Park Falls, WI	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Park Falls, WI Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (wells, pumphouse, water main)				
Parshall, North Dakota	0.0	0.0	300.0	0.0	0.0
	[SENATE] Water treatment facility improvements				
Pasadena, California	0.0	0.0	375.0	375.0	375.0
	[SENATE] A perchlorate treatment program [CONFERENCE] Perchlorate treatment program in the City of Pasadena, California				
Pascagoula, Mississippi	0.0	0.0	747,383.0	0.0	0.0
	[SENATE] A drinking water and wastewater treatment improvements project in the Chipley area [CONFERENCE] Drinking water and wastewater treatment improvements project in the Chipley area in the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi				
Passaic Valley, NJ	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,500.0	2,500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Passaic Valley, NJ Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission Combined Sewage Overflow Project				
Pecatonica, Illinois	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] Construction of a wastewater treatment facility [CONFERENCE] Construction of a wastewater treatment facility in the Village of Pecatonica, Illinois				
Pen Argyl Borough, PA	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	[CONFERENCE] Pen Argyl Borough, PA Wastewater Treatment Plant				
Penn Hills, Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0	200.0
	[SENATE] An interceptor improvements project in Penn Hills, Pennsylvania [CONFERENCE] Interceptor improvements project in Penn Hills, Pennsylvania				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Philadelphia, PA	0.0	0.0	0.0	695.0	695.0
	[CONFERENCE] Philadelphia, PA Southeastern Pennsylvania Waterways Restoration Stormwater Infrastructure Improvements				
Pinellas Park, FL	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,787.0	1,787.0
	[CONFERENCE] Pinellas Park, FL On-site Sewerage system elimination				
Pittsville, WI	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,900.0	1,900.0
	[CONFERENCE] Pittsville, WI Wastewater Treatment Plant/Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Plainville, Connecticut	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Infrastructure upgrades at water pollution control plant in the Town of Plainville, Connecticut				
Pleasant Plains, IL	0.0	0.0	0.0	765.0	765.0
	[CONFERENCE] Pleasant Plains, IL New Sanitary Sewer Collection System and Wastewater Treatment Facilities				
Pleasantville, PA	0.0	0.0	0.0	300.0	300.0
	[CONFERENCE] Pleasantville, PA Borough of Pleasantville Water System Improvements				
Plum Creek and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
	[SENATE] Combined sewer overflow and flood protection project [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow and flood protection project in the City of Plum Creek and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania				
Pontotoc, Mississippi	0.0	0.0	1,200.0	1,200.0	1,200.0
	[SENATE] Wastewater treatment facilities improvements [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment facilities improvements in the City of Pontotoc, Mississippi				
Port Byron, Illinois	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] Water system upgrades [CONFERENCE] Water system upgrades in the Village of Port Byron, Illinois				

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Port Huron, Michigan	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] A combined sewer overflow control program [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow control program for the City of Port Huron, Michigan				
Port Tobacco, MD	0.0	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0
	[CONFERENCE] Port Tobacco, MD Port Tobacco Watershed Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Pottstown, Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Stormwater infrastructure improvements project in the Borough of Pottstown, Pennsylvania				
Pownal, Vermont	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] A wastewater treatment project in the Town of Pownal, Vermont [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment project in the Town of Pownal, Vermont				
Rahway City Sanitary Sewer	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0
	[CONFERENCE] 250,000 for the Rahway City Sanitary Sewer I&I, and 250,000 for the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority				
Rapid City, South Dakota	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
	[SENATE] A water and wastewater master plan development in Rapid City, South Dakota [CONFERENCE] Water and wastewater master plan development in Rapid City, South Dakota				
Rhineland, WI	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Rhineland, WI Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (well, pumphouse, water main, storm sewer)				
Richmond/Rosenberg, TX	0.0	0.0	0.0	570.0	570.0
	[CONFERENCE] Richmond/Rosenberg, TX West Fort Bend County Regional Water System				
Ridgeland, Mississippi	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Riverdale, North Dakota					
Riverside, CA					
Rose Hill, KS					
Safford, AZ					
Saginaw, Michigan					
San Bernardino, CA					
San Francisco Public Utility Commission					
Sandborn, IN					
Sandy City, Utah					
Santa Jose, CA					

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Santa Paula, California	0.0	0.0	375.0	375.0	375.0
					[CONFERENCE] Santa Jose, CA Perchlorate Assistance Santa Clara Valley Water District
Saugerties, NY	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,100.0	2,100.0
					[SENATE] A water facility project [CONFERENCE] Water facility project in the City of Santa Paula, California
Seeley Lake Sewer District, Montana	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[CONFERENCE] Saugerties, NY Saugerties Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements
Seneca, MO	0.0	0.0	0.0	850.0	850.0
					[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment improvements in the Seeley Lake Sewer District, Montana
Sewer Improvement Consortium of Illinois	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
					[CONFERENCE] Wastewater improvements project in the City of Seneca, Missouri
Shreveport, Louisiana	0.0	0.0	400.0	400.0	400.0
					[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Sewer Improvement Consortium of Lake Bluff, Highwood, Highland Park and Lake Forest, Illinois
Sioux City, IA	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
					[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Shreveport Municipal Water Distribution system backflow prevention project in Shreveport, Louisiana
Solana Beach, CA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
					[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Construction of a wastewater treatment plant in Sioux City, Iowa
Somerset, KY	0.0	0.0	0.0	3,200.0	3,200.0
					[CONFERENCE] Solana Beach, CA Solana Beach Wastewater System Improvements
					[CONFERENCE] Somerset, KY Somerset Wastewater Treatment Plant

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
South Campbellsville, Kentucky	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] Wastewater sewer line extension project [CONFERENCE] Wastewater sewer line extension project in the City of South Campbellsville, Kentucky				
South Florida Water Management District	0.0	0.0	300.0	300.0	300.0
	[SENATE] Lake Region water treatment plant improvements [CONFERENCE] Lake Region water treatment plant improvements for the South Florida Water Management District				
South Lake Charles, LA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] South Lake Charles, LA Wastewater Treatment Plant				
Southeast Tennessee Development District	0.0	0.0	0.0	950.0	950.0
	[CONFERENCE] Southeast Tennessee Development District Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Cleveland 550k, Ducktown 150k, Spring City 250k)				
Southern California	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,000.0	4,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Southern California Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Mission Springs Water District 1.6M, Brinton Reservoir (Banning) 1M, Bighorn-Desert View Water Agency 500K, SAWPA SARI 450K, Yucca Valley 350K, Dunlap 100K)				
Sparta, NC & Independence, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Sparta, NC & Independence, VA Virginia Carolina Water Authority Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Spencer, WV	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Spencer, WV Spencer Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements				
Springfield, Illinois	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] Drinking water infrastructure improvements [CONFERENCE] Drinking water infrastructure improvements in the City of Springfield, Illinois				
Springfield, MO	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,200.0	1,200.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Tioga, LA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
	[CONFERENCE] Tioga, LA Water Works District No. 3 of Rapides Parish--Drinking Water Extension				
Traverse City, Michigan	0.0	0.0	150.0	150.0	150.0
	[SENATE] A septage treatment program in Traverse City, Michigan [CONFERENCE] Sewage treatment program in Traverse City, Michigan				
Tucson, AZ	0.0	0.0	0.0	450.0	450.0
	[CONFERENCE] Tucson, AZ Tucson Water Security Demonstration Project				
Tulpehocken Township, Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
	[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Central sewer collection and treatment replacement in Tulpehocken Township, Pennsylvania				
Twin Falls, Idaho	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] A wastewater treatment project [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment project in the City of Twin Falls, Idaho				
Twin, AL	0.0	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0
	[CONFERENCE] Twin, AL Twin Water Authority Water Systems Renovation				
Unalaska, Alaska	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
	[SENATE] A water and sewer project in Unalaska, Alaska [CONFERENCE] Water and sewer project				
Upland, Indiana	0.0	0.0	1,700.0	1,700.0	1,700.0
	[SENATE] Water infrastructure upgrades [CONFERENCE] Water infrastructure upgrades in the City of Upland, Indiana				
VA/MD/DC	0.0	0.0	0.0	521.0	521.0
	[CONFERENCE] National Capital Region, VA, MD, DC Real-Time Drinking Water Distribution Security Monitoring				
Valley County, Idaho	0.0	0.0	600.0	600.0	600.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount			
Valparaiso, IN			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Construction of a wastewater collection and treatment facility in Valley County, Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	825.0	825.0
Waitsfield, Vermont			[CONFERENCE] Valparaiso, IN Valparaiso Sewer Infrastructure Improvements	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
Wake County, NC			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Water treatment projects in the Town of Waitsfield, Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
Walden, Colorado			[CONFERENCE] Wake County, NC Jordan Lake Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
Walsh County, North Dakota			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Drinking water project in the Town of Walden, Colorado	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
Washburn, North Dakota			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Rural water district infrastructure improvements in Walsh County, North Dakota	0.0	0.0	400.0	700.0	700.0
Wauconda, Illinois			[SENATE] Regional water treatment facility improvements [CONFERENCE] Regional water treatment facility improvements in the City of Washburn, North Dakota	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
Waukesha, Wisconsin and			[SENATE] Drinking water improvements [CONFERENCE] Drinking water improvements in the City of Wauconda, Illinois	0.0	0.0	800.0	800.0	800.0
Wayne County, Michigan			[SENATE] A radionuclide standard drinking water project [CONFERENCE] Radionuclide standard drinking water project in the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
			[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Rouge River CSO, SSO Wet Weather demonstration project in Wayne County, Michigan					

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
West Rankin Water Authority in Mississippi	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
	[SENATE] Wastewater system rehabilitation [CONFERENCE] Wastewater system rehabilitation for the West Rankin Water Authority in Mississippi				
Westerly, Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	875.0	875.0	875.0
	[SENATE] A new water storage tank in the Town of Westerly, Rhode Island [CONFERENCE] New water storage tank in the Town of Westerly, Rhode Island				
Westernport, Maryland	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] Combined sewer overflow project [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow project in the City of Westernport, Maryland				
Wewoka, OK	0.0	0.0	0.0	275.0	275.0
	[CONFERENCE] Wewoka, OK City of Wewoka Well Water Access				
Wheeler, Mississippi	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
	[SENATE] A wastewater treatment improvements project in Wheeler, Mississippi [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment improvements project in Wheeler, Mississippi				
Willmar, Minnesota	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
	[SENATE] Construction of a new wastewater treatment plant [CONFERENCE] Construction of a new wastewater treatment plant in the City of Willmar, Minnesota				
Wilmington, Delaware	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[SENATE] A combined sewer overflow program [CONFERENCE] Combined sewer overflow program in the City of Wilmington, Delaware				
Wilson, NC	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
	[CONFERENCE] Wilson, NC Wilson Wastewater Infrastructure Program				
Winchester, Oregon	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	750.0
	[SENATE] Sanitary district facility upgrades [CONFERENCE] Sanitary district facility upgrades in the City of Winchester Bay, Oregon				
Wisdom Sewer District, Montana	0.0	0.0	500.0	500.0	500.0

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Yellow Springs, OH	0.0	0.0	0.0	125.0	125.0
York, Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0	700.0	700.0
York, Alabama	0.0	0.0	700.0	700.0	700.0
Yuma, Colorado	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<hr/>					
Infrastructure assistance – H. 126 C. 105	1,649,000.0	120,000.0	391,000.0	186,000.0	1,835,000.0
<p>[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater treatment improvements in the Wisdom Sewer District, Montana</p> <p>[CONFERENCE] Yellow Springs, OH Morris Bean Sanitary Sewer Connection Project</p> <p>[CONFERENCE] Sewer improvement project in the City of York, Alabama</p> <p>[SENATE] Sewer improvement project [CONFERENCE] Sewer improvement project in the City of York, Alabama</p> <p>[SENATE] [CONFERENCE] Wastewater facility upgrades in Yuma, Colorado</p> <p>[HOUSE] An increase of \$120,000,000 for the clean water State revolving funds, including the use of \$100,000,000 rescinded from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements from various EPA appropriation accounts. ... The Committee has also included bill language, as requested by the Administration and as carried in previous appropriations acts, to: (1) extend for an additional year the authority for States to transfer funds between the Clean Water SRF and the Drinking Water SRF; (2) waive the onethird of 1 percent cap on the Tribal set aside from nonpoint source grants; (3) increase to 1.5 percent the cap on the Tribal setaside for the Clean Water SRF; and (4) require that any funds provided to address the water infrastructure needs of colonias within the United States along the United StatesMexico border be spent only in areas where the local governmental entity has established an enforceable ordinance or rule which pre vents additional development within colonias that lack water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure. Bill language has been included stipulating that, consistent with section 603 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$50,000,000 of the \$850,000,000 proposed for the Clean Water SRF program is to be made available by the States for interestfree loans to increase nonpoint and nonstructural, decentralized alternatives and expand the choices</p>					

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
					<p>available to communities for clean water improvements. The Committee continues to support this program. ... No STAG technical correction may be made without advance consultation with the Committee. The EPA should report to the Committee within 30 days of the close of each fiscal year with a list of the technical corrections it has made to STAG special project infrastructure grants during that fiscal year and on funds transferred from projects to the drinking water and clean water SRFs. (126) ... From within the Committee's \$50,000,000 recommendation for the United States-Mexico Border program, the Agency is expected to continue the Brownsville, Texas area water supply project, and the El Paso, Texas area desalination and water supply project. (126) ... With respect to financial assistance from State Revolving Funds, States should give priority to projects that use best management practices that provide cost savings and increased efficiency. [CONFERENCE] There is an increase of \$20,000,000 for infrastructure assistance for Alaska Native villages, a net decrease of \$, ,000 [sic] for the clean water State revolving fund and a decrease of \$4,000,000 for infrastructure assistance for Puerto Rico. The House proposal to direct rescinded funds to the CWSRF is not included in the conference agreement.</p>
Alaska Native villages	15,000.0	0.0	25,000.0	20,000.0	35,000.0
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF)	730,000.0	20,000.0	370,000.0	170,000.0	900,000.0
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF): Use of balances from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements	0.0	100,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF)	850,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	850,000.0
Mexico border	50,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50,000.0

[SENATE] \$50,000,000 for the United States-Mexico Border program, which is equal to the request, and includes \$7,000,000 for the El Paso Utilities Board and \$2,000,000 for the

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

	President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
Puerto Rico	4,000.0	0.0	-4,000.0	-4,000.0	0.0

Reductions

Rescission of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements (various EPA accounts) – H. 125 C. 105

0.0	-100,000.0	-58,000.0	-80,000.0	-80,000.0
-----	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

[HOUSE] 1. [House Report Language] Funds associated with STAG special projects, from fiscal year 2000 or earlier, that have not received an approved grant by the end of fiscal year 2006 will be transferred to the appropriate State's Drinking Water or Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Bill language also provides for the transfer of funds, not needed for STAG projects, to the appropriate State's Drinking Water or Clean Water Revolving Fund (i.e., unused funds from completed projects or funds from projects that are determined to be ineligible for a grant) . (125) ... The Committee also recommends the rescission of \$100,000,000 in balances from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements from various EPA appropriation accounts and the use of these funds, as an additional amount of \$100,000,000, for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

[House Bill Language] For an additional amount for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, \$100,000,000 shall be made available from the rescissions of multi-year and no-year funding, previously appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, the availability of which under the original appropriation accounts has not expired, and \$100,000,000 in such funding is hereby rescinded: Provided, That such rescissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose availability under the original period for obligation for such grant, contract, or interagency agreement has expired based on the April 2005 review by the Government Accountability Office.

2. [SENATE]

[Senate Report Language] The Committee also recommends a rescission of \$58,000,000 in unobligated amounts associated with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose availability has expired.

[Senate Bill Language] Provided further, That from unobligated prior year funds in

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

President's Request	House Action vs. Request	Senate Action vs. Request	Conference vs. Request	Final Amount
				<p>appropriation accounts available to the Environmental Protection Agency, \$58,000,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That such rescissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose availability under the original period for obligation for such grant, contract, or interagency agreement has expired.</p> <p>3. [CONFERENCE] [Conference Report Language] The conference agreement modifies rescission language proposed by the House and the Senate and rescinds \$80,000,000 from expired grants, contracts and interagency agreements instead of a rescission of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and a rescission of \$58,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Although this language appears under the State and Tribal Assistance Grants heading, it applies to all EPA appropriation accounts. The conference agreement does not direct the rescinded funds to the clean water State revolving fund as proposed by the House nor does the language reference an April 2005 review by the Government Accountability Office as proposed by the House.</p> <p>[Conference Bill Language] In addition, \$80,000,000 is hereby rescinded from prior year funds in appropriation accounts available to the Environmental Protection Agency: Provided, That such rescissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose availability, under the original project period for such grant or interagency agreement or contract period for such contract, has expired: Provided further, That such rescissions shall include funds that were appropriated under this heading for special project grants in fiscal year 2000 or earlier that have not been obligated on an approved grant by September 1, 2006.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

Hazardous Substance Superfund

INTERIOR P.L.

Superfund Add'l Language – C. 104

[CONFERENCE] Language is included earmarking \$1,260,621,000 as the maximum payment from general revenues for Superfund instead of \$1,258,333,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,256,165,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers are concerned that EPA has not yet issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for Libby, Montana, despite years of cleanup efforts. The managers direct the Agency to issue its Record of Decision for Libby, Montana no later than May 1, 2006. EPA should also provide a report on the contents of the ROD to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than June 15, 2006. The managers are disappointed that the Agency could not meet an earlier deadline, originally proposed by the Senate, and expect periodic updates on the progress of completion of the ROD for Libby, Montana.

The House proposed a study by the National Academy of Sciences of Superfund mega sites that involve dredging. Upon further reflection, the managers believe that the appropriate role for the NAS is to act as an independent peer review body that will conduct an objective evaluation of some of the ongoing dredging projects underway at Superfund mega sites. By undertaking such an evaluation, the Academy can serve as an objective voice on this issue. The managers expect that the evaluation will be initiated by December 1, 2005, and finished as soon as possible, but no later than one year after the Academy begins work. In addition, the managers insist that any such evaluation by the Academy should not delay in any way the progress of the Hudson River PCB dredging project or any other Superfund dredging project.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

State and Tribal Assistance Grants

INTERIOR P.L.

STAG Add'l Language – C. 112

[CONFERENCE] Language is included making permanent the prohibition, proposed by the Senate, on the use of funds from the drinking water State revolving fund for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants. The managers note these studies are, and should continue to be, funded under the science and technology account.

Language is included, as proposed by the Senate, providing direction on the distribution of funds to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of Alaska Native villages.

Language proposed by the House referencing special project grants is included with a technical modification.

There is no earmark for the Fortuna Radar Site as proposed by the Senate.

Language is included making permanent the authority, proposed by the Senate, for States to transfer funds between the clean water and drinking water revolving funds.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the House, stipulating that special project funding from fiscal year 2000 or earlier that is not obligated on an approved grant by the end of fiscal year 2006 will be transferred to the appropriate State revolving fund. Instead, such funds that are not obligated on approved grants by September 1, 2006, are included in the rescission referenced above.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the House, providing for the transfer of excess funds after completion of special project grants to the appropriate State revolving fund. Instead such funds are included in the rescission referenced above.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the House, transferring funds from projects that are determined to be ineligible for a grant to the appropriate State revolving fund. The managers expect EPA to keep the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations apprised of grants that are determined to be ineligible.

Language is included making permanent the authority, proposed by the House, for EPA to make technical corrections to special project grants. The Senate had similar language but

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

used the phrase `notwithstanding any other provision of law'; whereas the House language and the language adopted in the conference agreement uses the phrase `notwithstanding this or previous appropriations Acts'.

The conference agreement includes a minor technical correction to the school bus retrofit language.

The managers agree to the following:

1. Within the funds provided for the United States-Mexico border program, \$4,000,000 is for the El Paso Utilities Board and \$3,000,000 is for the City of Brownsville water supply project.
2. Within the categorical grant targeted watersheds program, \$6,000,000 is for a regional pilot program for the Chesapeake Bay as described in Senate Report 109-80.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

Administrative Provisions

INTERIOR P.L.

Brownfields – H. 74 C. 33

[HOUSE] The bill includes a provision to extend eligibility to Brownfields sites that were purchased prior to the enactment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act of 2001. [CONFERENCE] Notwithstanding CERCLA 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV), appropriated funds for fiscal year 2006 may be used to award grants or loans under section 104(k) of CERCLA to eligible entities that satisfy all of the elements set forth in CERCLA section 101(40) to qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser except that the date of acquisition of the property was prior to the date of enactment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act of 2001.

Conference Report Comments – C. 113

[CONFERENCE] The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House regarding an exception to CERCLA relating to the qualifying date for brownfields grants or loans. The House had a single year provision. The Senate proposed to make this provision permanent.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the Senate, providing permanent authority for the use of brownfields grant funding for administrative expenses.

Expedited hiring of senior scientists – H. 74 S. 126 C. 33

[SENATE] The Committee has included bill language, requested by the Administration and supported by the Science Committee, permitting EPA to hire no more than 5 senior level scientists using expedited procedures. This authority is similar to that provided to the

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

National Institutes of Health. [CONFERENCE] For fiscal years 2006 through 2011, the Administrator may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, make not to exceed five appointments in any fiscal year under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209 for the Office of Research and Development.

Office of Research and Development – H. 74

[HOUSE] The Committee has included bill language providing certain personnel authority for the Office of Research and Development.

Pesticide Registration Fees – H. 74 C. 33

[HOUSE] The Committee includes language authorizing EPA to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended. [CONFERENCE] The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003), as amended.

Radon Program Cost Share – H. 74

[HOUSE] The Committee has included a provision that addresses the Federal cost share for the radon program.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

Section 306 Radon Program – C. 34

[CONFERENCE] Beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, and notwithstanding section 306 of the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Federal share of the cost of radon program activities implemented with Federal assistance under section 306 shall not exceed 60 percent in the third and subsequent grant years.

Small engine regulations – H. 74

[HOUSE] Bill language requires EPA to complete and publish a technical study to look at safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers in use, associated with compliance with small engines regulations, required pursuant to Public Law 108-199. The Committee directs EPA to coordinate this study with the U.S. Fire Administration and/or the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. The study of small engines in use by consumers shall include real-world scenarios involving at minimum: operator burn, fire due to contact with flammable items, and refueling.

Tribal Programs – H. 74 S. 126 C. 33

[HOUSE] The Committee has included bill language, as proposed in the budget request and as carried in previous appropriations acts, permitting EPA, in carrying out environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, to use cooperative agreements with federally-recognized tribes and inter-tribal consortia. [SENATE] The Committee has, again this year, included an administrative provision giving the Administrator specific authority, in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, to award cooperative agreements to Federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia so as to properly carry out EPA's environmental programs. [CONFERENCE] For fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

General Provisions

INTERIOR P.L.

Conference Report Comments – C. 113

[CONFERENCE] Section 201 modifies language, proposed by the Senate in sections 201 and 202 and by the House in section 434, dealing with human dosing studies. The managers note the many concerns expressed on both the House and Senate floors with respect to intentional human toxicity dosing studies relied upon by the EPA in reviewing applications for pesticide approvals. Concern is particularly acute for pregnant women, fetuses, and children. The managers believe this is a very serious issue that needs to be addressed by EPA as soon as possible. The managers have included statutory language that prohibits the EPA from accepting, considering, or relying on third party intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides until EPA issues a final rulemaking addressing such studies. The language also requires EPA to provide for at least a 90-day public comment period on its proposed rule and to issue the final rule no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act. Such rule shall not permit the use of pregnant women, infants or children as subjects; shall be consistent with the principles proposed in the 2004 report of the National Academy of Sciences on intentional human dosing and the principles of the Nuremberg Code with respect to human experimentation; and shall establish an independent Human Subjects Review Board.

Section 202 includes the text of Senate section 435 prohibiting the use of funds in contravention of Executive Order 12898 dealing with environmental justice. The House had a similar provision in section 432 of the House bill. The Senate provision that is included in the conference agreement includes a reference to the date of the Executive Order and to the Federal Register notice in which it was published.

Section 203 includes the text of House section 433 prohibiting the use of funds to finalize, issue, implement, or enforce the existing EPA wastewater blending policy.

Section 204 includes the text of Senate section 436 prohibiting the use of funds in contravention of 15 U.S.C. 2682(c)(3), dealing with lead-based paint, or to delay implementation of that provision of law.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

Section 205 includes language, as proposed by the Senate under Administrative Provisions for the EPA, prohibiting the use of funds to publish proposed or final regulations relating to certain small engines required by section 428(b) of division G of Public Law 108-199 until the Administrator has completed and published a technical study of safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers.

Sec. 201 – C. 34

[CONFERENCE] None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to accept, consider or rely on third-party intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides, or to conduct intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides until the Administrator issues a final rulemaking on this subject. The Administrator shall allow for a period of not less than 90 days for public comment on the Agency's proposed rule before issuing a final rule. Such rule shall not permit the use of pregnant women, infants or children as subjects; shall be consistent with the principles proposed in the 2004 report of the National Academy of Sciences on intentional human dosing and the principles of the Nuremberg Code with respect to human experimentation; and shall establish an independent Human Subjects Review Board. The final rule shall be issued no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Sec. 202 – C. 34

[CONFERENCE] None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of, or to delay the implementation of, Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 7629; relating to Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SUMMARY OF FY 2006 BILL AND REPORT LANGUAGE BY APPROPRIATION
(dollars in thousands)

Sec. 203 – C. 34

[CONFERENCE] None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, issue, implement, or enforce the proposed policy of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled 'National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Requirements for Municipal Wastewater Treatment During Wet Weather Conditions', dated November 3, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 63042).

Sec. 204 – C. 34

[CONFERENCE] None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of 15 U.S.C. 2682(c)(3) or to delay the implementation of that section.

Sec. 205 – C. 34

[CONFERENCE] None of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to publish proposed or final regulations pursuant to the requirements of section 428(b) of division G of Public Law 108-199 until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, has completed and published a technical study to look at safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers in use, associated with compliance with the regulations. Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall complete and publish the technical study.

One Hundred Ninth Congress
of the
United States of America

AT THE FIRST SESSION

*Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday,
the fourth day of January, two thousand and five*

An Act

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$860,791,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,250,000 is for high priority projects, to be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; and of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2006 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred.

In addition, \$32,696,000 is for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program; to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than \$860,791,000, and \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities.

H. R. 2361—29

(b) The funds appropriated in subsection (a) shall only be made available after the entire amount is matched by non-Federal contributions (not including in-kind contributions) that are pledged and received after July 26, 2005, but prior to the date specified in subsection (c).

(c) Section 508(b)(2) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 is amended by striking “November 12, 2006” and inserting “November 12, 2008”.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$741,722,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project; and not to exceed \$19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,381,752,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, including administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$37,455,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

H. R. 2361—30

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$40,218,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project; \$1,260,621,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund upon the date of enactment of this Act as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to \$1,260,621,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$13,536,000 shall be transferred to the “Office of Inspector General” appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2007, and \$30,606,000 shall be transferred to the “Science and Technology” appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2007.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$73,027,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency’s responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$15,863,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$3,261,696,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$900,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the “Act”); of which up to \$50,000,000 shall be available for loans, including interest free loans as authorized by 33 U.S.C.

1383(d)(1)(A), to municipal, inter-municipal, interstate, or State agencies or nonprofit entities for projects that provide treatment for or that minimize sewage or stormwater discharges using one or more approaches which include, but are not limited to, decentralized or distributed stormwater controls, decentralized wastewater treatment, low-impact development practices, conservation easements, stream buffers, or wetlands restoration; \$850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, hereafter none of the funds made available under this heading in this or previous appropriations Acts shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; \$50,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; \$35,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and waste infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages: *Provided*, That, of these funds: (1) the State of Alaska shall provide a match of 25 percent; (2) no more than 5 percent of the funds may be used for administrative and overhead expenses; and (3) not later than October 1, 2005 the State of Alaska shall make awards consistent with the State-wide priority list established in 2004 for all water, sewer, waste disposal, and similar projects carried out by the State of Alaska that are funded under section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1301) or the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) which shall allocate not less than 25 percent of the funds provided for projects in regional hub communities; \$200,000,000 shall be for making special project grants for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying this Act, and, for purposes of these grants, each grantee shall contribute not less than 45 percent of the cost of the project unless the grantee is approved for a waiver by the Agency; \$90,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs; \$7,000,000 for making cost-shared grants for school bus retrofit and replacement projects that reduce diesel emissions; and \$1,129,696,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which \$50,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended, \$20,000,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs, and \$16,856,000 shall be for making competitive

targeted watershed grants: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, State authority under section 302(a) of Public Law 104–182 shall remain in effect: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2006 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under title VI of that Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of that Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding this or any other appropriations Act, heretofore and hereafter, after consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and for the purpose of making technical corrections, the Administrator is authorized to award grants under this heading to entities and for purposes other than those listed in the joint explanatory statements of the managers accompanying the Agency’s appropriations Acts for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure and for water quality protection.

In addition, \$80,000,000 is hereby rescinded from prior year funds in appropriation accounts available to the Environmental Protection Agency: *Provided*, That such rescissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose availability, under the original project period for such grant or interagency agreement or contract period for such contract, has expired: *Provided further*, That such rescissions shall include funds that were appropriated under this heading for special project grants in fiscal year 2000 or earlier that have not been obligated on an approved grant by September 1, 2006.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency’s function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the

absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003), as amended.

Notwithstanding CERCLA 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV), appropriated funds for fiscal year 2006 may be used to award grants or loans under section 104(k) of CERCLA to eligible entities that satisfy all of the elements set forth in CERCLA section 101(40) to qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser except that the date of acquisition of the property was prior to the date of enactment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act of 2001.

For fiscal years 2006 through 2011, the Administrator may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, make not to exceed five appointments in any fiscal year under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209 for the Office of Research and Development.

Beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, and notwithstanding section 306 of the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Federal share of the cost of radon program activities implemented with Federal assistance under section 306 shall not exceed 60 percent in the third and subsequent grant years.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 201. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to accept, consider or rely on third-party intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides, or to conduct intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides until the Administrator issues a final rulemaking on this subject. The Administrator shall allow for a period of not less than 90 days for public comment on the Agency's proposed rule before issuing a final rule. Such rule shall not permit the use of pregnant women, infants or children as subjects; shall be consistent with the principles proposed in the 2004 report of the National Academy of Sciences on intentional human dosing and the principles of the Nuremberg Code with respect to human experimentation; and shall establish an independent Human Subjects Review Board. The final rule shall be issued no later than 180-days after enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of, or to delay the implementation of, Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 7629; relating to Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations).

SEC. 203. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, issue, implement, or enforce the proposed policy of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled "National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Requirements for

H. R. 2361—34

Municipal Wastewater Treatment During Wet Weather Conditions”, dated November 3, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 63042).

SEC. 204. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of 15 U.S.C. 2682(c)(3) or to delay the implementation of that section.

SEC. 205. None of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to publish proposed or final regulations pursuant to the requirements of section 428(b) of division G of Public Law 108–199 until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, has completed and published a technical study to look at safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers in use, associated with compliance with the regulations. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall complete and publish the technical study.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, \$283,094,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$60,267,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis program.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, including treatments of pests, pathogens, and invasive or noxious plants and for restoring and rehabilitating forests damaged by pests or invasive plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities and conducting an international program as authorized, \$283,577,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law of which \$57,380,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands shall be available until the Forest Service notifies the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in writing, of specific contractual and grant details including the non-Federal cost share: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, \$1,000,000 shall be provided to Custer County, Idaho, for economic development in accordance with the Central Idaho Economic Development and Recreation Act, subject to authorization: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided under this heading, an advance lump sum payment of \$1,000,000 shall be made available to Madison County, North Carolina, for a forest recreation center, and a similar \$500,000 payment shall be made available to Folkmoot USA in Haywood County, North Carolina, for Appalachian folk programs including forest crafts.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND
 RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2006

MAY 13, 2005.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
 the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, from the Committee on
 Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2361]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006. The bill provides regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior (except the Bureau of Reclamation), the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
Title I—Department of the Interior:		
Bureau of Land Management	2	9
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	10	21
National Park Service	19	33
U.S. Geological Survey	26	49
Minerals Management Service	29	54
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	31	58
Bureau of Indian Affairs	34	63
Departmental Offices	42	73
Department of the Interior General Provisions	50	85

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
Title II—Environmental Protection Agency:		
Science and Technology	63	88
Environmental Programs Management	64	95
Office of Inspector General	64	106
Buildings and Facilities	65	109
Hazardous Substance Superfund	65	111
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	66	117
Oil Spill Response	66	119
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	66	121
Title III—Related Agencies:		
Forest Service, USDA	74	127
Indian Health Service, DHHS	87	152
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	95	157
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	96	158
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	97	158
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	98	159
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	99	159
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	100	160
Smithsonian Institution	100	160
National Gallery of Art	103	162
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	105	165
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	105	167
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	106	168
Commission of Fine Arts	108	172
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	109	172
National Capital Planning Commission	109	173
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum	109	173
Presidio Trust	110	174
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remem- brance	110	174
Title IV—General Provisions	110	174

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a Statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	Sec. 302(b)		This bill—	
	Discretionary	Mandatory	Discretionary	Mandatory
Budget authority	26,107	54	26,107	54
Outlays	27,500	60	27,496	60

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee has conducted hearings on the programs and projects provided for in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for 2006. The hearings are contained in 9 published volumes totaling nearly 10,000 pages.

During the course of the hearings, testimony was taken at 10 hearings on 8 days, not only from agencies which come under the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee, but also, in written form, from Members of Congress, State and local government officials, and private citizens.

The bill that is recommended for fiscal year 2006 has been developed after careful consideration of all the facts and details available to the Committee.

BUDGET AUTHORITY RECOMMENDED IN BILL BY TITLE

Activity	Budget estimates, fiscal year 2006	Committee bill, fiscal year 2006	Committee bill compared with bud- get estimates
Title I, Department of the Interior: New Budget (obligational) authority	\$9,792,069,000	\$9,808,693,000	+\$16,624,000
Title II, Environmental Protection Agency: New Budget (obligational) authority	7,520,600,000	7,708,027,000	+187,427,000
Title III, related agencies: New Budget (obligational) authority	8,411,659,000	8,642,405,000	+230,746,000
Grand total, New Budget (obligational) authority	25,724,328,000	26,159,125,000	+434,797,000

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

In addition to the amounts in the accompanying bill, which are reflected in the table above, permanent legislation authorizes the continuation of certain government activities without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriations process.

Details of these activities are listed in tables at the end of this report. In fiscal year 2005, these activities are estimated to total \$3,568,891,000. The estimate for fiscal year 2006 is \$3,658,910,000.

The following table reflects the total budget (obligational) authority contained both in this bill and in permanent appropriations for fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, AND RELATED AGENCIES TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005–2006

Item	Fiscal year 2005	Fiscal year 2006	Change
Interior, Environment, and related agencies appropriations bill	\$26,982,234,000	\$26,159,125,000	–\$823,109,000
Permanent appropriations, Federal funds	2,985,066,000	3,047,966,000	+62,900,000
Permanent appropriations, trust funds	583,825,000	610,944,000	+27,119,000
Total budget authority	30,551,125,000	29,818,035,000	–733,090,000

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

The following tabulation indicates total new obligational authority to date for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, and the amount recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2006. It compares receipts generated by activities in this bill on an actual basis for fiscal year 2004 and on an estimated basis for fiscal years 2005 and 2006. The programs in this bill are estimated to generate \$13.9 billion in revenues for the Federal Government in fiscal year 2006. Therefore, the expenditures in this bill will contribute to economic stability rather than inflation.

Item	Fiscal year—		
	2004	2005	2006
New obligational authority	\$27,316,209,000	\$26,982,234,000	\$26,159,125,000
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior	9,643,359,000	12,497,212,000	13,418,547,000
Forest Service	445,533,000	439,106,000	447,050,000
Total receipts	10,088,892,000	12,936,318,000	13,865,597,000

APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

The level at which sequestration reductions shall be taken pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if such reductions are required in fiscal year 2006, is defined by the Committee as follows:

As provided for by section 256(1)(2) of Public Law 99–177, as amended, and for the purpose of a Presidential Order issued pursuant to section 254 of said Act, the term “program, project, and activity” for items under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Related Agencies of the House of Representatives and the Senate is defined as (1) any item specifically identified in tables or written material set forth in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, or accompanying committee reports or the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference; (2) any Government-owned or Government-operated facility; and (3) management units, such as National parks, National forests, National fish hatcheries, National wildlife refuges, research units, regional, State and other administrative units and the like, for which funds are provided in fiscal year 2006.

The Committee emphasizes that any item for which a specific dollar amount is mentioned in any accompanying report, including all increases over the budget estimate approved by the Committee, shall be subject to a percentage reduction no greater or less than the percentage reduction applied to all domestic discretionary accounts.

FEDERAL FUNDING OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends appropriations of new budget authority aggregating \$5.9 billion for Indian programs in fiscal year 2006. This is an increase of \$108 million above the budget request and an increase of \$108 million above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2005. Spending for Indian services by the Federal Government in total is included in the following table.

GOVERNMENT-WIDE FEDERAL FUNDING FOR NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2004 actual	FY 2005 enacted	FY 2006 Pres. bud	Change from FY05
Department of Agriculture	798,812	877,371	899,771	22,400
Army Corps of Engineers	34,490	41,376	22,829	– 18,547
Department of Commerce	20,945	21,668	20,657	– 1,011
Department of Defense	18,000	18,000	0	– 18,000
Department of Education	2,438,510	2,524,650	2,550,101	25,451
Department of Health & Human Services	4,263,144	4,359,999	4,456,322	96,323

GOVERNMENT-WIDE FEDERAL FUNDING FOR NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2004 actual	FY 2005 enacted	FY 2006 Pres. bud	Change from FY05
Department of Housing & Urban Development	733,085	650,970	590,796	− 60,174
Department of the Interior	2,887,399	3,030,079	2,984,840	− 45,239
Department of Justice	234,594	232,016	245,185	13,169
Department of Labor	69,602	69,032	68,488	− 544
Department of Transportation	274,861	329,491	329,581	90
Department of Veterans Affairs	571	567	580	13
Environmental Protection Agency	243,895	239,004	205,560	− 33,443
Small Business Administration	1,979	987	0	− 987
Smithsonian Institution	51,630	45,925	45,792	− 133
Department of the Treasury	4,000	4,000	0	− 4,000
Other Agencies & Independent Agencies	96,924	101,594	39,582	− 62,012
Grand Total	12,172,441	12,546,729	12,460,084	− 86,644

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives states that:

Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states: “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law. * * *”

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee has revised the reprogramming guidelines to add an exception for certain Environmental Protection Agency grants (section 3(b)) and to delete certain instructions to the Forest Service dealing with boundary adjustments and transfer of funds.

The following are the procedures governing reprogramming actions for programs and activities funded in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act:

1. *Definition.*—“Reprogramming,” as defined in these procedures, includes the reallocation of funds from one budget activity to another. In cases where either Committee report displays an allocation of an appropriation below the activity level, that more detailed level shall be the basis for reprogramming. For construction accounts, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project (identified in the justification or Committee report) to another. A reprogramming shall also consist of any significant departure from the program described in the agency’s budget justifications. This includes proposed reorganizations even without a change in funding.

2. *Guidelines for Reprogramming.*—(a) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises; and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appro-

priation year would result in actual loss or damage. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

(b) Any project or activity, which may be deferred through reprogramming, shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming; but, instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through the regular appropriations process.

(c) Reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited or increased by the Congress in the Act or the report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee, regardless of amounts involved, and be fully explained and justified.

(d) Reprogramming proposals submitted to the Committee for approval shall be considered approved 30 calendar days after receipt if the Committee has posed no objection. However, agencies will be expected to extend the approval deadline if specifically requested by either Committee.

(e) Proposed changes to estimated working capital fund bills and estimated overhead charges, deductions, reserves or holdbacks, as such estimates were presented in annual budget justifications, shall be submitted through the reprogramming process.

3. *Criteria and Exceptions.*—Any proposed reprogramming must be submitted to the Committee in writing prior to implementation if it exceeds \$500,000 annually or results in an increase or decrease of more than 10 percent annually in affected programs, with the following exceptions:

(a) With regard to the tribal priority allocations activity of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operations of Indian Programs account, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among the programs within this activity. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during the first six months of the fiscal year by no later than May 1 of each year, and shall provide a final report of all reprogrammings for the previous fiscal year by no later than November 1 of each year.

(b) With regard to the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants account, reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for partnership grants do not need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations. In addition, the Agency need not submit a request to move funds between wastewater and drinking water objectives for those grants targeted to specific communities.

4. *Quarterly Reports.*—(a) All reprogrammings shall be reported to the Committee quarterly and shall include cumulative totals. (b) Any significant shifts of funding among object classifications also should be reported to the Committee.

5. *Administrative Overhead Accounts.*—For all appropriations where costs of overhead administrative expenses are funded in part from “assessments” of various budget activities within an appropriation, the assessments shall be shown in justifications under the discussion of administrative expenses.

6. *Contingency Accounts.*—For all appropriations where assessments are made against various budget activities or allocations for

contingencies, the Committee expects a full explanation, separate from the justifications. The explanation shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the fund. The Committee expects reports each year detailing the use of these funds. In no case shall a fund be used to finance projects and activities disapproved or limited by Congress or to finance new permanent positions or to finance programs or activities that could be foreseen and included in the normal budget review process. Contingency funds shall not be used to initiate new programs.

7. *Declarations of Taking.*—The Committee directs the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service to seek Committee approval in advance of filing declarations of taking.

8. *Report Language.*—Any limitation, directive, or earmarking contained in either the House or Senate report which is not contradicted by the other report nor specifically denied in the conference report shall be considered as having been approved by both Houses of Congress.

9. *Assessments.*—No assessments shall be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act unless such assessments and the basis therefore are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees, in compliance with these procedures.

10. *Land Acquisitions and Forest Legacy.*—Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91-646) except for condemnations and declarations of taking, unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval in compliance with these procedures.

11. *Land Exchanges.*—Land exchanges, wherein the estimated value of the Federal lands to be exchanged is greater than \$500,000, shall not be consummated until the Committees on Appropriations have had a 30-day period in which to examine the proposed exchange.

12. *Appropriations Structure.*—The appropriation structure for any agency shall not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

FUNDING FIXED COSTS

The Committee commends the Administration for funding the full amount for anticipated pay cost and fixed cost increases for most bureaus and programs. The Committee has been concerned that the base operational capability of the programs funded in this bill has been declining due to unmet pay and fixed costs. The Committee urges the Administration to continue to include full uncontrollable costs in future budget submissions.

ALLOCATING CONGRESSIONAL FUNDING PRIORITIES

The Committee continues to be concerned that the agencies funded by this Act are not following a standard methodology for allocating appropriated funds to the field where Congressional funding priorities are concerned. When Congressional instructions are provided, the Committee expects these instructions to be closely mon-

itored and followed. The Committee directs that earmarks for Congressional funding priorities be first allocated to the receiving units, and then all remaining funds should be allocated to the field based on established procedures. Field units or programs should not have their allocations reduced because of earmarks for Congressional priorities without direction from or advance approval of the Committee.

FOCUSING ON CORE PROGRAMS

The Committee's fiscal year 2006 budget recommendations reflect the necessity to stay within a constrained allocation in this time of conflict in Iraq and homeland security concerns. The recommendations are also sensitive to the need to address the budget deficit. The Committee's recommendations reflect the belief that: (1) proposed cuts to many core programs are unacceptable; (2) large increases for grant programs are unrealistic; (3) reductions to Indian health, welfare and education programs are unacceptable; (4) critical forest health programs must be continued; (5) untested and unproven grant programs and new land acquisition are a low priority; and (6) large, expensive partnership projects that have not been approved in advance by the Committee are unacceptable because they result in additional operational costs and displace critical backlog maintenance requirements.

Reductions to programs in Indian Country, including education grants, welfare programs, and Indian school and hospital construction funding have been restored to the maximum extent possible given the overall funding available in the Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2006. We must maintain our commitments to American Indian and Alaska Natives and critically needed education and health programs are central to our ability to meet those commitments.

Wildfire management efforts and forest health programs are some of the most critically important core programs on which the Committee has focused scarce resources. The Committee recommendation increases funding for wildland fire management by \$351 million above the request and \$146 million above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, including a total of \$492 million for hazardous fuels reduction. In addition, the Committee has maintained funding for critical and essential forest health management programs and for national fire plan support. Without these funds, we will not be able to protect communities and natural resources and we will have ever-increasing wildfire suppression costs in the future and the number and severity of large fire events will grow.

The Committee believes strongly that the agencies funded in the Interior and Related Agencies bill need to more effectively manage the funds they have. Travel costs need to be closely monitored and controlled. The number, size, and cost of government-sponsored conferences also should be reduced.

The Committee expects the Departments and agencies funded in this bill to make maximum use of low cost airfares, consistent with General Services Administration guidelines. The GSA permits the use of lower fares, available to the general public, offered by non-contract carriers, if such use will result in a lower total trip cost. Consistent with GSA guidelines, the Committee expects each Department and agency to determine if such lower fares are available

and, if so, those lower fares should be used unless the contract carrier that would have otherwise been used will provide a comparable fare. This direction applies to all official travel funded in this bill.

Major new construction projects should not be initiated at the expense of critical operations and maintenance requirements. Likewise, no new construction project should be initiated without a thorough analysis of the future staffing, operations, and maintenance costs that will result, and the Committee should be consulted at the earliest possible stage when a major construction project is under consideration. This has been a particular problem in the National Park Service.

The Committee appreciates the need for information technology improvements, enterprise services networks, and implementing portions of the President's management agenda. However, to date, a lot of funding has been dedicated to these initiatives without a well thought-out and reasonable approach to addressing requirements. Commercially available systems, through the private sector, should be used to the maximum extent possible rather than building customized new systems. Likewise, the Committee does not endorse the practice of assessing costs against programs to build bigger administrative bureaucracies in response to new administrative and technology requirements or the practice of reducing program budgets on the basis of presumed future savings. These costs should be clearly justified and requested under administrative accounts and any future savings associated with administrative improvements should be demonstrated before budget reductions are proposed. While portions of the Administration's management agenda may indeed be useful, funds should not be taken from all agencies to provide centralized funding for the various lead agencies. If funding is needed for government wide initiatives, it should be requested and managed by each lead agency.

The Committee has made difficult choices in formulating its fiscal year 2006 budget recommendations. Each agency funded in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies bill needs to examine its way of doing business in these constrained fiscal times and focus on its core, proven programs and on better management of resources.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Committee has been unable to provide funds for the Cooperative Conservation Initiative challenge cost share program because of severe fiscal constraints. However, the Committee remains supportive of the concept and has continued the traditional agency challenge cost share program. The Committee has no objection to broadening the scope of the ongoing program to encompass resource protection activities.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the multiple use management, protection, and development of a full range of natural resources, including minerals, timber, rangeland, fish and wildlife habitat, and wilderness on about 261 million acres of the Nation's public lands and for management of 700 million additional acres of Federally-owned subsurface mineral rights. The Bureau is

Section 118 continues a provision allowing the Secretary to pay private attorney fees for employees and former employees in connection with *Cobell v. Norton*.

Section 119 continues a provision dealing with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's responsibilities for mass marking of salmonid stocks.

Section 120 requires the use of Departmental Management funds for operational needs at the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge airport.

Section 121 prohibits the conduct of gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) on lands described in section 123 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, or land that is contiguous to that land.

Section 122 continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds to study or implement a plan to drain or reduce water levels in Lake Powell.

Section 123 allows the National Indian Gaming Commission to collect \$12,000,000 in fees for fiscal year 2006.

Section 124 makes funds appropriated for fiscal year 2006 available to the tribes within the California Tribal Trust Reform Consortium and others on the same basis as funds were distributed in fiscal year 2005, and separates this demonstration project from the Department of the Interior's trust reform reorganization.

Section 125 provides for the renewal of certain grazing permits in the Jarbidge Field office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Section 126 authorizes the acquisition of lands and leases for Ellis Island.

Section 127 permits the Secretary of the Interior to issue grazing permits within the Mojave National Preserve.

Section 128 implements rules concerning winter snowmobile use on Yellowstone National Park.

Section 129 limits the use of funds for staffing for the Department of Interior's Office of Law Enforcement and Security.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The Environmental Protection Agency was created by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, which consolidated nine programs from five different agencies and departments. Major EPA programs include air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, research, pesticides, radiation, toxic substances, enforcement and compliance assurance, pollution prevention, oil spills, Superfund, Brownfields, and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program. In addition, EPA provides Federal assistance for wastewater treatment, sewer overflow control, drinking water facilities, and other water infrastructure projects. The agency is responsible for conducting research and development, establishing environmental standards through the use of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, monitoring pollution conditions, seeking compliance through a variety of means, managing audits and investigations, and providing technical assistance and grant support to States and tribes, which are delegated authority for actual program implementation. Under existing statutory authority, the Agency may contribute to specific homeland security efforts and may participate in some international environmental activities.

Among the statutes for which the Environmental Protection Agency has sole or significant oversight responsibilities are:

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.
 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.
 Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended.
 Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.
 Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.
 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.
 Oil Pollution Act of 1990.
 Public Health Service Act (Title XIV), as amended.
 Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended.
 Clean Air Act, as amended.
 Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended.
 Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002.
 Bioterrorism Act of 2002.
 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended.
 Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002 (amending CERCLA).
 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986.
 Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.
 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.
 Pollution Prosecution Act of 1990.
 Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003.

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends \$7,708,027,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency, a decrease of \$318,458,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level and \$187,427,000 above the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed in each of the appropriation accounts.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. In 2001, the EPA requested that the National Academy of Sciences review the situation regarding the use of human studies. In its 2005 report, the Committee urged EPA to consider the Academy's recommendations on the use of human volunteer studies in its regulatory programs. EPA is currently following the Academy's recommendations on the use of human volunteer studies and, on February 8, 2005, issued a Federal Register notice clarifying its policy. The notice outlines EPA's plans for rulemaking. The Committee commends EPA for its clarification of policy with respect to human studies and will continue to monitor the Agency's efforts in this area.

2. The Committee continues to be concerned that unclear regulations, conflicting court decisions, and inadequate scientific information are creating confusion about the extent to which reporting requirements in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act cover emissions from poultry, dairy, or livestock operations. Producers want to meet their environmental obligations but need clarification from the Environmental Protection Agency on whether these laws apply to their operations. The Committee believes that an expeditious resolution of this matter is warranted.

3. The Committee expects the EPA to prepare its fiscal year 2007 budget justification in the order specified in the table accom-

panying this report and to delineate clearly the differences between the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the fiscal year 2007 request for each activity. The Committee recommends discontinuing the annual operating plan beginning in fiscal year 2006. The Committee has approved the fiscal year 2005 operating plan.

4. The Committee generally has provided funding for fixed cost increases, as requested, including pay costs, rent, utilities, and security. The Committee has also agreed to many of the proposed realignments of programs. EPA should only make further adjustments, consistent with the requirements of the reprogramming guidelines contained in the front of this report. Also, in accordance with the reprogramming guidelines, the Committee should be notified regarding reorganizations of offices, programs, or activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations.

5. The EPA should review the distribution of funds among regions and make adjustments, as needed, to ensure that funding is strategically aligned to meet the highest priority needs.

6. EPA should establish and enforce, through the Office of Environmental Information, an information technology management policy with an emphasis on standardization across all of EPA.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Science and Technology account funds all Environmental Protection Agency research (including, by transfer of funds, Hazardous Substances Superfund research activities) carried out through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, States, universities, and private business, as well as in-house research. This account also funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, supplies and operating expenses for all Agency research. Research addresses a wide range of environmental and health concerns across all environmental media and encompasses both long-term basic and near-term applied research to provide the scientific knowledge and technologies necessary for preventing, regulating, and abating pollution, and to anticipate emerging environmental issues.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$744,061,000
Budget estimate, 2006	760,640,000
Recommended, 2006	765,340,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+21,279,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+4,700,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Science and Technology				
Air toxics and quality				
Clean air allowance trading programs.....	8,734	9,353	9,353	+619
Federal support for air quality management.....	10,521	10,016	10,016	-505
Federal support for air toxics program.....	2,562	2,265	2,265	-297
Federal vehicle and fuels standards/certification...	57,436	66,567	59,567	+2,131
Radiation: Protection.....	3,069	2,121	2,121	-948
Radiation: Response preparedness.....	2,320	3,576	3,576	+1,256
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality.....	84,642	93,898	86,898	+2,256
Enforcement				
Forensics support.....	13,048	13,737	13,737	+689
Climate protection				
Climate protection program.....	19,006	17,732	20,032	+1,026
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection				
Critical infrastructure protection (except water sentinel).....	3,495	3,569	3,569	+74
Water sentinel and related training.....	---	44,000	9,000	+9,000
Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection.....	3,495	47,569	12,569	+9,074
				-35,000

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Recommended	Enacted Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					

Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery					
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities)	13,671	14,806	14,806	+1,135	---
Decontamination	13,609	24,710	16,710	+3,101	-8,000
Laboratory preparedness and response	---	600	600	+600	---
Safe buildings	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
(Transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(2,071)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(-71)	---
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery	27,280	44,116	36,116	+8,836	-8,000
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure	2,024	2,100	2,100	+76	---
Subtotal, Homeland security	32,799	93,785	50,785	+17,986	-43,000
IT / Data management	4,345	4,251	4,251	-94	---
Indoor air					
Indoor air: Radon program	495	442	442	-53	---
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program	843	---	---	-843	---
Reduce risks from indoor air	---	832	832	+832	---
Subtotal, Indoor air	1,338	1,274	1,274	-64	---
Operations and administration					
Facilities infrastructure and operations	8,466	8,716	8,716	+250	---

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Pesticide licensing					
Pesticides: Registration of new pesticides.....	2,466	2,490	2,490	+24	---
Pesticides: Review/Reregistration of existing pesticides.....	2,478	2,506	2,506	+28	---
Subtotal, Pesticide licensing.....	4,944	4,996	4,996	+52	---
Research / Congressional priorities.....	65,665	---	40,000	-25,665	+40,000
Research: Clean air					
Research: Air toxics.....	16,956	16,387	16,387	-569	---
Research: Global change.....	19,578	20,534	20,534	+956	---
Research: National ambient air quality standards...	---	71,451	71,451	+71,451	---
Research: Particulate matter.....	60,863	---	---	-60,863	---
Research: Troposphere ozone.....	4,041	---	---	-4,041	---
Subtotal, Research: Clean air.....	101,438	108,372	108,372	+6,934	---
Research: Clean water					
Research: Drinking water.....	48,665	45,690	45,690	-2,975	---
Research: Water quality.....	44,993	55,900	55,900	+10,907	---
Subtotal, Research: Clean water.....	93,658	101,590	101,590	+7,932	---

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
Research: Human health and ecosystems					
Human health risk assessment.....	32,723	36,240	36,240	+3,517	---
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(3,559)	(4,022)	(4,022)	(+463)	---
Research: Computational toxicology.....	11,994	13,832	12,632	+638	-1,200
Research: Endocrine disruptor.....	10,392	8,705	10,605	+213	+1,900
Research: Fellowships.....	12,042	8,327	12,027	-15	+3,700
Research: Human health and ecosystems.....	167,356	169,632	177,632	+10,276	+8,000
Subtotal, Research: Human health and ecosystems	234,507	236,736	249,136	+14,629	+12,400
Research: Land protection					
Research: Land protection and restoration.....	9,065	13,696	13,696	+4,631	---
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(22,994)	(23,099)	(23,099)	(+105)	---
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(6,596)	(1,485)	(1,485)	(-5,111)	---
Subtotal, Research: Land protection.....	9,065	13,696	13,696	+4,631	---
Research: Sustainability					
Research: Economics and decision science.....	---	2,645	2,645	+2,645	---
Research: Environmental technology verification (ETV).....	3,181	3,203	3,203	+22	---
Research: Pollution prevention.....	37,232	---	---	-37,232	---
(By transfer from hazardous substance superfund)...	(588)	---	---	(-588)	---
Research: Sustainability (other activities).....	---	23,188	23,188	+23,188	---
Subtotal, Research: Sustainability.....	40,413	29,036	29,036	-11,377	---
Toxic research and prevention					
Research: Pesticides and toxics.....	27,792	29,753	29,753	+1,961	---

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
Water: Human health protection				
Drinking water programs.....	2,935	3,068	3,068	+133
Total, Science and Technology.....	744,061	760,640	765,340	+4,700
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(35,808)	(30,606)	(30,606)	(-5,202)

The Committee recommends \$765,340,000 for science and technology, an increase of \$21,279,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level and \$4,700,000 above the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends that \$30,606,000, as requested, be transferred to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account for ongoing research activities consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

Air Toxics and Quality.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$7,000,000 for Federal support for the air toxics program.

Climate Protection Program.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,300,000 for the climate protection program. Direction on the use of these funds is provided below.

Homeland Security.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$35,000,000 for Water Sentinel and related training, and a decrease of \$8,000,000 in preparedness, response, and recovery for the decontamination program. While the amount provided is less than the budget request, there is an increase above the fiscal year 2005 level for these programs.

Research: Congressional Priorities.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$40,000,000 for programs of national and regional significance that have been funded through this program/project in at least 3 of the last 4 years. Direction on the use of these funds is provided below.

Human Health and Ecosystems.—The Committee recommends a net increase of \$12,400,000 for human health and ecosystems including a decrease of \$1,200,000 for computational toxicology and increases of \$1,900,000 for endocrine disruptor research, \$3,700,000 for fellowships through the Science to Achieve Results program, and \$8,000,000 for other human health and ecosystems research of which \$4,000,000 is for exploratory grants, \$2,900,000 is for ecosystem protection research, \$600,000 is for aggregate risk research, and \$500,000 is for condition assessments of estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. EPA is encouraged to increase its use of private sector capability in the clean automotive technology program. The increase provided for the climate protection program is to ensure that not less than \$10,000,000 is used for competitively awarded contract research and engineering services and activities. The private sector has significant research capability that is used by EPA through this program, to develop clean, cost effective, highly fuel-efficient engines and powertrain technologies.

2. The EPA should develop clear goals and milestones for the Water Sentinel program, including the use of real-time monitoring; seek the advice of the Science Advisory Board; and justify more clearly the funding request for the program, in the context of the overall plan, in the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

3. The Committee does not agree with the transfer of research funds to the Office of Air and Radiation, the Office of Water, the Solid Waste and Emergency Response program, and the Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances program. The Office of Research and Development should coordinate closely with these offices on their research needs. There should be an emphasis on

using the Science to Achieve Results grants program whenever practicable.

4. The Committee has included \$40,000,000 for Programs of National and Regional Significance with the expectation that the EPA will conduct a competitive solicitation among programs that have been added by the Congress to the Science and Technology account in at least 3 of the last 4 years. The Committee notes that many of these Congressional priorities provide invaluable assistance to the EPA and are performed at a cost substantially less than if EPA were to institute such programs in-house. A competitive solicitation should ensure that the highest priority national and regional programs continue to be funded.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

The Environmental Programs and Management account encompasses a broad range of abatement, prevention, and compliance activities, and personnel compensation, benefits, travel, and expenses for all programs of the Agency except Science and Technology, Hazardous Substance Superfund, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, Oil Spill Response, and the Office of Inspector General.

Abatement, prevention, and compliance activities include setting environmental standards, issuing permits, monitoring emissions and ambient conditions, and providing technical and legal assistance toward enforcement, compliance, and oversight. In most cases, the States are directly responsible for actual operation of the various environmental programs and the Agency's activities include oversight and assistance.

In addition to program costs, this account funds administrative costs associated with the operating programs of the Agency, including support for executive direction, policy oversight, resources management, general office and building services for program operations, and direct implementation of Agency environmental programs for Headquarters, the ten EPA Regional offices, and all non-research field operations.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$2,294,902,000
Budget estimate, 2006	2,353,764,000
Recommended, 2006	2,389,491,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+94,589,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+35,727,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Environmental Programs and Management				
Air toxics and quality				
Clean air allowance trading programs.....	16,873	18,234	18,234	+1,361
Federal stationary source regulations.....	21,768	23,509	23,509	+1,741
Federal support for air quality management				
Federal support for air quality management (except clean diesel).....	88,192	95,891	95,891	+7,699
Clean diesel initiative.....	---	15,000	10,000	+10,000 -5,000
Subtotal, Federal support for air quality management.....				
	88,192	110,891	105,891	+17,699 -5,000
Federal support for air toxics program.....				
Radiation: Protection.....	24,590	25,431	25,431	+841
Radiation: Response preparedness.....	11,122	11,765	11,765	+643
Stratospheric ozone: Domestic programs.....	2,624	2,636	2,636	+12
Stratospheric ozone: Multilateral fund.....	5,013	3,969	5,169	+156
	9,920	13,500	10,500	+580 -3,000
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality.....				
	180,102	209,935	203,135	+23,033 -6,800
Brownfields.....				
	24,301	29,638	24,638	+337 -5,000
Climate protection program				
Climate protection program (other activities).....	43,910	41,030	41,030	-2,880
Energy star.....	46,700	50,500	50,000	+3,300 -500
Methane to markets.....	300	4,000	500	+200 -3,500
Subtotal, Climate protection.....				
	90,910	95,530	91,530	+620 -4,000

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Compliance					
Compliance assistance and centers.....	26,613	29,097	29,097	+2,484	---
Compliance incentives.....	8,963	9,622	9,622	+659	---
Compliance monitoring.....	66,328	93,412	90,512	+24,184	-2,900
Subtotal, Compliance.....	101,904	132,131	129,231	+27,327	-2,900
Enforcement					
Civil enforcement.....	112,463	117,462	114,462	+1,999	-3,000
Criminal enforcement.....	39,101	37,326	36,326	-2,775	-1,000
Enforcement training.....	3,428	2,499	2,499	-929	---
Environmental justice.....	5,883	3,980	3,980	-1,903	---
NEPA implementation.....	12,039	12,440	12,440	+401	---
Subtotal, Enforcement.....	172,914	173,707	169,707	-3,207	-4,000
Environmental protection / Congressional priorities...	92,326	---	40,000	-52,326	+40,000
Geographic programs					
Geographic program: Chesapeake Bay.....	22,756	20,746	20,746	-2,010	---
Geographic program: Great Lakes.....	21,287	21,519	21,519	+232	---
Geographic program: Gulf of Mexico.....	3,895	4,468	4,468	+573	---
Geographic program: Lake Champlain.....	2,480	955	2,000	-480	+1,045
Geographic program: Long Island Sound.....	2,332	477	2,000	-332	+1,523
Geographic program: Puget Sound.....	---	---	2,000	+2,000	+2,000

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Geographic program: Other					
Community action for a renewed environment (CARE)	1,984	9,000	3,000	+1,016	-6,000
Other activities	4,923	4,186	4,186	-737	---
Subtotal, Geographic program: Other	6,907	13,186	7,186	+279	-6,000
Regional geographic initiatives	7,687	8,862	7,762	+75	-1,100
Subtotal, Geographic programs	67,344	70,213	67,681	+337	-2,532
Homeland security					
Homeland security: Communication and information					
Communication and information (other activities)	5,133	5,450	5,450	+317	---
Laboratory preparedness and response	---	1,230	1,230	+1,230	---
Subtotal, Homeland security: Communication and information	5,133	6,680	6,680	+1,547	---
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection					
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination)	6,896	6,747	6,747	-149	---
Decontamination	---	100	100	+100	---
Subtotal, Homeland security: critical infrastructure protection	6,896	6,847	6,847	-49	---
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery					
Decontamination	1,822	3,448	3,448	+1,626	---

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure.....	6,294	6,403	6,403	109
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	20,145	23,378	23,378	+3,233
Indoor air				
Indoor air: Asthma program.....	10,468	---	---	-10,468
Indoor air: Environment tobacco smoke program.....	2,400	---	---	-2,400
Indoor air: Radon program.....	5,142	5,918	5,918	+776
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program.....	9,326	---	---	-9,326
Reduce risks from indoor air.....	---	23,496	23,496	+23,496
Subtotal, Indoor air.....	27,336	29,414	29,414	+2,078
Information exchange / Outreach				
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination.....	5,970	6,890	6,890	+920
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations	48,624	49,753	49,753	+1,129
Environmental education.....	8,957	---	9,000	+43
Exchange network.....	16,361	22,739	18,739	+2,378
Small business ombudsman.....	3,712	3,911	3,911	+199
Small minority business assistance.....	2,264	2,348	2,348	+84
State and local prevention and preparedness.....	11,855	12,328	12,328	+473
Toxics release inventory (TRI) / Right to know.....	14,310	14,754	14,754	+444
Tribal - Capacity building.....	10,640	11,049	11,049	+409
Subtotal, Information exchange / Outreach.....	122,693	123,772	128,772	+6,079
				+5,000

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
International programs				
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination.....	244	---	---	-244
Commission for environmental cooperation.....	3,773	4,210	4,210	+437
Environment and trade.....	1,500	1,787	1,787	+287
International capacity building.....	5,751	6,450	6,450	+699
Persistent organic pollutants (POPs) implementation. U.S. / Mexico border.....	1,627	2,806	2,806	+1,179
	5,612	5,975	5,975	+363
Subtotal, International programs.....	18,507	21,228	21,228	+2,721
IT / Data management / Security				
Information security.....	4,131	3,888	3,888	-243
IT / Data management.....	106,123	105,999	95,999	-10,124
Subtotal, IT / Data management / Security.....	110,254	109,887	99,887	-10,367
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review				
Administrative law.....	4,890	5,109	5,109	+219
Alternative dispute resolution.....	931	1,051	1,051	+120
Civil rights / Title VI compliance.....	12,119	12,530	12,530	+411
Legal advice: Environmental program.....	34,644	36,314	36,314	+1,670
Legal advice: Support program.....	12,555	13,088	13,088	+533
Regional science and technology.....	3,245	3,643	3,643	+398
Regulatory innovation.....	20,014	25,021	25,021	+5,007
Regulatory/Economic-management and analysis.....	14,821	16,713	16,713	+1,892
Science advisory board.....	4,361	4,881	4,881	+520
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review.....	107,580	118,350	118,350	+10,770

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Request
	Enacted	Request	Recommended	Enacted
Operations and administration				
Acquisition management.....	22,714	23,055	23,055	+341
Central planning, budgeting, and finance.....	69,387	72,790	72,790	+3,403
Facilities infrastructure and operations	314,614	358,046	353,046	+38,432
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements management.....	20,366	19,916	19,916	-450
Human resources management.....	39,461	38,872	38,872	-589
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	466,542	512,679	507,679	+41,137
Pesticide licensing				
Pesticides: Field programs.....	24,362	24,683	24,683	+321
Pesticides: Registration of new pesticides.....	39,159	41,472	41,472	+2,313
Pesticides: Review/Reregistration of existing pesticides.....	51,315	57,991	54,950	+3,635
Science policy and biotechnology.....	1,640	1,751	1,751	+111
Subtotal, Pesticide licensing.....	116,476	125,897	122,856	+6,380
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)				
RCRA: Corrective action.....	39,667	42,710	42,710	+3,043
RCRA: Waste management.....	66,696	68,728	68,728	+2,032
RCRA: Waste minimization and recycling.....	11,508	14,376	14,376	+2,868
RCRA: General reduction.....	---	---	-5,000	-5,000
Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	117,871	125,814	120,814	+2,943
				-5,000

	(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Enacted	Recommended versus Request

Toxics risk review and prevention					
Toxic substances: Chemical risk management.....	8,341	9,058	9,058	+717	---
Toxic substances: Chemical risk review & reduction.	44,814	44,523	45,523	+709	+1,000
Endocrine disruptors.....	8,540	9,097	9,097	+557	---
Toxic substances: Lead risk reduction program.....	10,970	10,549	10,549	-421	---
Pollution prevention program.....	16,408	19,990	17,990	+1,582	-2,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Toxics risk review and prevention.....	89,073	93,217	92,217	+3,144	-1,000

Underground storage tanks.....	7,125	7,719	7,719	+594	---

Water: Ecosystems					
Great Lakes Legacy Act.....	22,320	50,000	28,000	+5,680	-22,000
National estuary program / Coastal waterways.....	25,065	19,446	24,446	-619	+5,000
Wetlands.....	20,085	20,375	20,375	+290	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems.....	67,470	89,821	72,821	+5,351	-17,000

Water: Human health protection					
Beach/Fish programs.....	3,210	3,264	3,264	+54	---
Drinking water programs.....	93,258	101,090	98,090	+4,832	-3,000
National Rural Water Association.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Water: Human health protection.....	96,468	104,354	111,354	+14,886	+7,000

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Water quality protection				
Marine pollution.....	11,358	12,279	12,279	+921
Surface water protection				
Surface water protection (other activities).....	179,503	185,501	185,501	+5,998
Water quality monitoring.....	6,700	9,300	9,300	+2,600
Subtotal, Surface water protection.....	186,203	194,801	194,801	+8,598
Subtotal, Water quality protection.....	197,561	207,080	207,080	+9,519
Subtotal, Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,294,902	2,403,764	2,389,491	+94,589
Offsetting receipts from toxics and pesticides fees.....	---	-50,000	---	+50,000
Total, Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,294,902	2,353,764	2,389,491	+94,589
				+35,727

The Committee recommends \$2,389,491,000 for environmental programs and management, an increase of \$94,589,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level and \$35,727,000 above the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

Brownfields.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$5,000,000 for Brownfields support.

Air Toxics and Quality.—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$6,800,000 for air toxics and quality, including a decrease of \$5,000,000 in Federal support for air quality management for the clean diesel initiative, an increase of \$1,200,000 for stratospheric ozone/domestic programs, and a decrease of \$3,000,000 for stratospheric ozone/multilateral fund.

Climate Protection.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$4,000,000 for climate protection, including decreases of \$500,000 for Energy Star and \$3,500,000 for the methane to markets initiative.

Compliance.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$2,900,000 for compliance monitoring, including decreases of \$1,800,000 to reduce the rescission-related restoration proposed in the budget and \$1,100,000 for regional program support.

Enforcement.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$4,000,000 for enforcement, including decreases of \$3,000,000 for civil enforcement and \$1,000,000 for criminal enforcement.

Environmental Protection: Congressional Priorities.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$40,000,000 for programs of national and regional significance that have been funded through this program/project in at least 3 of the last 4 years. Direction on the use of these funds is provided below. The Committee notes that the National Rural Water Association program has been moved to the Water: Health Protection/Drinking Water Programs portion of the environmental programs and management account.

Geographic Programs.—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$2,532,000 for geographic programs, including increases of \$1,045,000 for Lake Champlain, \$1,523,000 for Long Island Sound, and \$2,000,000 for Puget Sound, and decreases of \$6,000,000 for community action for a renewed environment and \$1,100,000 for regional geographic initiatives.

Information Exchange/Outreach.—The Committee recommends a net increase of \$5,000,000 for information exchange/outreach, including an increase of \$9,000,000 for environmental education and a decrease of \$4,000,000 for the exchange network.

Information Technology/Data Management.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$10,000,000 for information technology/data management. A large amount of funding for these activities was transferred to the compliance program in the budget request. After accounting for that transfer, the Committee's recommendation provides an increase above the fiscal year 2005 level for data system improvements.

Operations and Administration.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$5,000,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations.

Pesticide Licensing.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$3,041,000 for pesticides: review/reregistration of existing pesticides, which leaves an increase of \$3,635,000 above the enacted level.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.—The Committee recommends a general reduction of \$5,000,000 for RCRA activities. The Committee notes that, after this reduction, the Agency will retain an increase of nearly \$3,000,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level. The increase above the enacted level should be used for the highest priority activities.

Toxics Risk Review and Prevention.—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$1,000,000 for toxics risk review and prevention, including an increase of \$1,000,000 for chemical risk review and a decrease of \$2,000,000 for the pollution prevention program.

Water: Ecosystems.—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$17,000,000 for water/ecosystems, including a decrease of \$22,000,000 for Great Lakes Legacy Act programs (which leaves an increase of 25 percent above the fiscal year 2005 level) and an increase of \$5,000,000 for the National Estuary Program. Direction on both of these programs is provided below.

Water: Human Health Protection.—The Committee recommends a net increase of \$7,000,000 for water/human health protection, including a decrease of \$3,000,000 for drinking water programs and an increase of \$10,000,000 for the National Rural Water Association.

Receipts from Toxics and Pesticides Fees.—The Administration proposed a \$50,000,000 reduction to the environmental programs and management account under the assumption that legislation would be enacted to increase fees on pesticide registrations and that \$50,000,000 would be made available, as a result, to offset appropriations. The Committee notes that no legislative proposal has been received from the Administration and it is unlikely that these receipts will be available for fiscal year 2006 as explained below. Therefore, the Committee recommends an increase of \$50,000,000 to ensure that critical programs in this area continue. The Committee believes that the budget should not assume the use of receipts that are dependent on the enactment of subsequent legislation unless such legislation is under active consideration by the Congress.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The pesticide Safety Education Program should be funded at \$1,200,000 in fiscal year 2006.

2. EPA has adopted regulations to reduce emissions from on-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles beginning in 2007 and from off-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles beginning in 2010. These regulations will apply to new vehicles and not to the millions of existing vehicles, which will probably not be fully replaced until 2030. Through the clean diesel initiative, EPA is working to retrofit existing vehicles with new emission reduction technologies. These include the accelerated use of new fuels, after-treatment of diesel exhaust with retrofit technology, and replacing and rebuilding older engines with new cleaner engine technology. The Committee has provided \$10,000,000 in support of these efforts.

3. A total of \$24,446,000 is included for the National Estuary Program, which includes \$500,000 for each of the 28 NEP estuaries and \$10,446,000 for other activities in support of the program.

4. The Committee has included \$40,000,000 for Programs of National and Regional Significance with the expectation that the EPA

will conduct a competitive solicitation among special programs that have been added by the Congress to the Environmental Programs and Management account in at least 3 of the last 4 years. The Committee notes that many of these Congressional priorities provide invaluable assistance to the EPA and are performed at a cost substantially less than if EPA were to institute such programs in house. A competitive solicitation should ensure that the highest priority national and regional programs continue to be funded.

5. The EPA needs to develop a clear plan for the Great Lakes Legacy Act implementation and explain in future budget requests how the requested funding for that program supports the plan.

6. When Congress enacted the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) of 2003 to allow EPA to collect new pesticide registration fees, it specifically prohibited the collection of any new tolerance fees by the EPA. However, the Administration assumed the use of receipts from registration fees as part of its fiscal year 2005 and 2006 budget requests. EPA should not spend time proposing fees and promulgating rules in conflict with PRIA and should use its limited resources on other, more productive pesticide work.

7. The Committee expects EPA to encourage local governments and communities to pursue innovative public-private partnerships, such as the Adopt-A-Waterway program, which, at no additional cost to the taxpayers, help to implement storm water pollution prevention activities, curb urban runoff, and improve water quality. Further, the Committee encourages EPA to work with the States to enter into public-private partnerships, such as Adopt-A-Waterway, to fulfill their public education and outreach responsibilities.

8. The Committee is aware that the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma has applied for treatment as a State status under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the "Clean Water Act") and that the issue is currently under litigation. The Committee will watch with interest the resolution of this issue.

9. The Committee is aware of TCE contamination affecting a large number of homes in Endicott and Ithaca, NY, which is due to vapor intrusion of TCE contaminants into the basements of homes. The Committee is further aware that EPA is in the process of finalizing its TCE risk assessment and that this is a process that is likely to continue over the next two years or more. EPA has indicated that it is currently evaluating a number of interim approaches for screening levels for TCE while awaiting the final assessment. The Committee strongly urges EPA to work with the State of New York to adopt protective interim approaches, as soon as practicable, including consideration of provisional screening levels based upon the 2001 Human Health Risk Assessment. Finally, the Committee expects EPA to keep it informed periodically on progress on the development and implementation of interim procedures and actions at these sites and on completion of the new EPA risk assessment.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) provides audit, evaluation, and investigation products and advisory services to improve the performance and integrity of EPA programs and operations. This account funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, and expenses (excluding rent, utilities, and security costs) for the Office

of Inspector General. In addition to the funds provided under this heading, the OIG receives funds by transfer from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account. The IG also holds the position of Inspector General for the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$37,696,000
Budget estimate, 2006	36,955,000
Recommended, 2006	37,955,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+259,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+1,000,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request

Office of Inspector General				
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	37,696	36,955	37,955	+259
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)....	(12,896)	(13,536)	(13,536)	(+640)
				+1,000

The Committee recommends \$37,955,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of \$259,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level and \$1,000,000 above the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends that \$13,536,000, as requested, be transferred to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account. The Committee expects that \$1,000,000 will be used to carry out the duties of Inspector General for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

The Buildings and Facilities account provides for the design and construction of EPA-owned facilities as well as for the repair, extension, alteration, and improvement of facilities used by the Agency. The funds are used to correct unsafe conditions, protect health and safety of employees and Agency visitors, and prevent deterioration of structures and equipment.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$41,688,000
Budget estimate, 2006	40,218,000
Recommended, 2006	40,218,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	-1,470,000
Budget estimate, 2006	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request

Buildings and Facilities				
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure.....	11,408	11,500	11,500	+92
Operations and administration				
Facilities infrastructure and operations.....	27,280	28,718	28,718	+1,438
Subtotal, Buildings and Facilities.....	38,688	40,218	40,218	+1,530
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	3,000	---	---	-3,000
=====				
Total, Buildings and Facilities.....	41,688	40,218	40,218	-1,470
=====				

The Committee recommends \$40,218,000, the budget request, for buildings and facilities, a decrease of \$1,470,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The Hazardous Substance Superfund (Superfund) program was established in 1980 by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act to clean up emergency hazardous materials, spills, and dangerous, uncontrolled, and/or abandoned hazardous waste sites. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) expanded the program substantially in 1986, authorizing approximately \$8,500,000,000 in revenues over five years. In 1990, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act extended the program's authorization through 1994 for \$5,100,000,000 with taxing authority through calendar year 1995.

The Superfund program is operated by EPA subject to annual appropriations from a dedicated trust fund and from general revenues. Enforcement activities are used to identify and induce parties responsible for hazardous waste problems to undertake clean-up actions and pay for EPA oversight of those actions. In addition, responsible parties have been required to cover the cost of fund-financed removal and remedial actions undertaken at spills and waste sites by Federal and State agencies. Transfers from this account are made to the Office of Inspector General and Science and Technology accounts for Superfund-related activities.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$1,247,477,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,279,333,000
Recommended, 2006	1,258,333,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+10,856,000
Budget estimate, 2006	-21,000,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Hazardous Substance Superfund				
Air toxics and quality				
Radiation: Protection.....	2,031	2,387	2,387	+356
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	12,896	13,536	13,536	+640
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General).....	(-12,896)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-640)
Enforcement				
Civil enforcement.....	122	883	883	+761
Criminal enforcement.....	7,895	9,504	8,504	+609
Enforcement training.....	822	614	614	-208
Environmental justice.....	938	845	845	-93
Forensics support.....	4,112	3,840	3,840	-272
Superfund: Enforcement.....	153,266	164,258	157,258	+3,992
Superfund: Federal facilities enforcement.....	10,667	10,241	10,241	-426
Subtotal, Enforcement.....	177,822	190,185	182,185	+4,363
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers.....	---	23	23	+23
Compliance incentives.....	145	168	168	+23
Compliance monitoring.....	159	1,157	1,157	+998
Subtotal, Compliance.....	304	1,348	1,348	+1,044
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Communication and information				
Laboratory preparedness and response.....	---	300	300	+300

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Enacted	Recommended versus Request

Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection					
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination)	1,923	852	852	-1,071	---
Decontamination	---	200	200	+200	---

Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection	1,923	1,052	1,052	-871	---

Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery					
Decontamination	8,283	12,550	10,550	+2,267	-2,000
Laboratory preparedness and response	---	9,500	---	---	-9,500
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities)	25,996	26,915	26,915	+919	---
(Transfer to Science and Technology)	(-2,071)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	(+71)	---

Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery	34,279	48,965	37,465	+3,186	-11,500

Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure	672	600	600	-72	---

Subtotal, Homeland security	36,874	50,917	39,417	+2,543	-11,500

Information exchange / Outreach					
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations Exchange network	155	161	161	+6	---
	2,235	1,676	1,676	-559	---

Subtotal, Information exchange / Outreach	2,390	1,837	1,837	-553	---

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
			Requested	Enacted

IT / Data management / Security				
Information security.....	406	409	409	+3
IT / Data management.....	17,945	16,113	16,113	-1,832

Subtotal, IT / Data management / Security.....	18,351	16,522	16,522	-1,829

Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review				
Alternative dispute resolution.....	845	985	985	+140
Legal advice: Environmental program.....	816	836	836	+20

Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review.....	1,661	1,821	1,821	+160

Operations and administration				
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements management				
Facilities infrastructure and operations.....	2,943	2,579	2,579	-364
Acquisition management.....	67,080	72,726	71,226	+4,146
Human resources management.....	18,888	20,367	20,367	+1,479
Central planning, budgeting, and finance.....	4,376	4,790	4,790	+414

Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	20,379	22,445	22,445	+2,066

Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	113,666	122,907	121,407	+7,741

Research: Human health and ecosystems				
Human health risk assessment.....	3,559	4,022	4,022	+463
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-3,559)	(-4,022)	(-4,022)	(-463)

Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration.....	22,994	23,099	23,099	+105
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-22,994)	(-23,099)	(-23,099)	(-105)

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Research: Superfund innovative technology (SITE) program.....	6,596	1,485	1,485	-5,111
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-6,596)	(-1,485)	(-1,485)	(+5,111)
Subtotal, Research: Land protection.....	29,590	24,584	24,584	-5,006
Research: Sustainability Pollution prevention.....	588	---	---	-588
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-588)	---	---	(+588)
Superfund cleanup				
Superfund: Emergency response and removal.....	198,494	198,000	198,000	-494
Superfund: EPA emergency preparedness.....	10,009	10,507	10,507	+498
Superfund: Federal facilities.....	31,512	31,611	31,611	+99
Superfund: Remedial.....	597,139	599,395	599,395	+2,256
Superfund: Support to other Federal agencies.....	10,591	9,754	9,754	-837
Subtotal, Superfund cleanup.....	847,745	849,267	849,267	+1,522
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,247,477	1,279,333	1,258,333	+10,856
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General).....	(-12,896)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-640)
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-35,808)	(-30,606)	(-30,606)	(+5,202)

The Committee recommends \$1,258,333,000 for hazardous substance superfund, an increase of \$10,856,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level and \$21,000,000 below the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

Enforcement.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$8,000,000 for enforcement, including decreases of \$1,000,000 for criminal enforcement and \$7,000,000 for superfund enforcement.

Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$11,500,000 for homeland security: preparedness, response, and recovery, including decreases of \$2,000,000 for decontamination and \$9,500,000 for laboratory preparedness and response.

Operations and Administration.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$1,500,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations.

Bill language.—Bill language is included, as requested, transferring \$13,536,000 to the Office of Inspector General and \$30,606,000 to the Science and Technology account.

The Committee is aware of the Hudson River PCB Superfund Site and the burdens it has placed on the Town of Fort Edward, New York, which will host the dewatering facility for site remediation. The Committee is concerned that the Town of Fort Edward does not have the capacity to alleviate the multi-year impacts of this remediation without assistance. The Committee expects the EPA to provide assistance to the maximum extent possible, including financial and staffing assistance, to the Town of Fort Edward throughout the duration of this project and to maintain a close dialogue with the Town of Fort Edward and the Committee. The Committee also expects the EPA to provide semiannual reports on the Hudson River PCB Superfund project to the Committee.

In 2001, the National Academy of Sciences issued “A Risk-Management Strategy for PCB-Contaminated Sediments” that noted the lack of information on the effectiveness of remedial actions at contaminated sediment sites. The report called for more evaluations of remedial efforts to determine the effectiveness of such remedies, particularly dredging, in achieving projected environmental benefits. Currently, about 140 contaminated sediment sites are in some stage of the Superfund process. A number of these sites are “mega” sites with large potential costs for both public and private parties. The Committee believes that independent experts should take another look at this issue with an emphasis on mega sites. Accordingly, the Committee expects the EPA to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to examine whether: (1) actual costs match EPA estimates; (2) EPA estimated risk reduction benefits are being achieved as predicted; (3) such risk reduction benefits will be achieved significantly faster than other less costly remedial alternatives, including source control and natural recovery; (4) EPA is considering remedial alternatives on an equal footing, or dredging is the presumptive remedy; (5) EPA is considering potential adverse consequences of all remedial alternatives consistent with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act; and (6) EPA regions are following agency sediment guidance and recommendations made by the Academy in its 2001 report. EPA should complete arrangements with the Academy for this study no later than December 1, 2005, and the study should be provided to the Committee no later than December 1, 2006.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, authorized the establishment of a response program for clean-up of releases from leaking underground storage tanks. Owners and operators of facilities with underground tanks must demonstrate financial responsibility and bear initial responsibility for clean-up. The Federal trust fund is funded through the imposition of a motor fuel tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon, which generates approximately \$170,000,000 per year.

Most States also have their own leaking underground storage tank programs, including a separate trust fund or other funding mechanism. The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund provides additional clean-up resources and may also be used to enforce necessary corrective actions and to recover costs expended from the Fund for clean-up activities. The underground storage tank response program is designed to operate primarily through cooperative agreements with States. However, funds are also used for grants to non-State entities, including Indian tribes, under Section 8001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$69,440,000
Budget estimate, 2006	73,027,000
Recommended, 2006	73,027,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+3,587,000
Budget estimate, 2006	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	(dollars in thousands) Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks					
Compliance					
Compliance assistance and centers.....	855	774	774	-81	---
IT / Data management.....	176	178	178	+2	---
Operations and administration					
Acquisition management.....	341	346	346	+5	---
Central planning, budgeting, and finance.....	866	936	936	+70	---
Facilities infrastructure and operations.....	872	884	884	+12	---
Human resources management.....	3	3	3	---	---
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	2,082	2,169	2,169	+87	---
Research: Land protection and restoration.....					
Underground storage tanks	624	646	646	+22	---
Underground storage tanks.....	9,279	10,584	10,584	+1,305	---
LUST Cooperative agreements.....	56,424	58,676	58,676	+2,252	---
Subtotal, Underground storage tanks.....	65,703	69,260	69,260	+3,557	---
=====					
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program.	69,440	73,027	73,027	+3,587	---
=====					

The Committee recommends \$73,027,000, the budget request, for the leaking underground storage tank program, an increase of \$3,587,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds to prepare for and prevent releases of oil and other petroleum products in navigable waterways. In addition, EPA is reimbursed for incident specific response costs through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund managed by the United States Coast Guard.

EPA is responsible for directing all clean-up and removal activities posing a threat to public health and the environment; conducting site inspections; providing a means to achieve cleanup activities by private parties; reviewing containment plans at facilities; reviewing area contingency plans; pursuing cost recovery of fund-financed clean-ups; and conducting research of oil clean-up techniques. Funds for this appropriation are provided through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund which is composed of fees and collections made through provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the Comprehensive Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act, the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. Pursuant to law, the Trust Fund is managed by the United States Coast Guard.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$15,872,000
Budget estimate, 2006	15,863,000
Recommended, 2006	15,863,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	-9,000
Budget estimate, 2006	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request

Oil Spill Response				
Enforcement				
Civil enforcement.....	1,742	1,789	1,789	+47
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers.....	274	287	287	+13
IT / Data management.....	33	33	33	---
Oil spill: Prevention, preparedness and response.....	12,465	12,344	12,344	-121
Operations and administration				
Facilities infrastructure and operations.....	463	504	504	+41
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration.....	895	906	906	+11
=====				
Total, Oil Spill Response.....	15,872	15,863	15,863	-9
=====				

The Committee recommends \$15,863,000, the budget request, for oil spill response, a decrease of \$9,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

The State and Tribal Assistance Grants account provides grant funds for programs operated primarily by State, local, tribal and other governmental partners. The account provides funding for infrastructure projects through the State Revolving Funds, geographic specific projects in rural Alaska and Alaska Native Villages, Puerto Rico, and on the United States-Mexico Border, and other targeted special projects. In addition, the account funds Brownfields assessment and revitalization grants, grants for clean school buses, and miscellaneous other categorical grant programs.

The largest portion of the STAG account consists of State Revolving Funds (SRFs), which provide Federal financial assistance to protect the Nation's water resources. The Clean Water SRFs help eliminate municipal discharge of untreated or inadequately treated pollutants and thereby help maintain or restore the country's water to a swimmable and/or fishable quality. The Clean Water SRFs provide resources for municipal, inter-municipal, State, and interstate agencies and tribal governments to plan, design, and construct wastewater facilities and other projects, including non-point source, estuary, stormwater, and sewer overflow projects. The Safe Drinking Water SRFs finance improvements to community water systems so that they can achieve compliance with the mandates of the Safe Drinking Water Act and continue to protect public health.

Categorical grant programs include non-point source grants under Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, Public Water System Supervision grants, Section 106 water quality grants, grants to improve targeted watersheds, Clean Air Act Section 105 and 103 air grants, grants targeted to environmental information, Brownfields cleanup grants, and other grants used by the States, tribes, and others to meet Federal environmental statutory and regulatory requirements.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$3,575,349,000
Budget estimate, 2006	2,960,800,000
Recommended, 2006	3,127,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	-447,549,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+167,000,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					

State and Tribal Assistance Grants					
Air toxics and quality					
Clean school bus initiative.....	7,440	10,000	10,000	+2,560	---
Brownfields					
Brownfields projects.....	89,280	120,500	95,500	+6,220	-25,000
Infrastructure assistance					
Infrastructure assistance: Alaska Native villages..	44,640	15,000	15,000	-29,640	---
Infrastructure assistance: Clean water state revolving fund (SRF).....	1,091,200	730,000	750,000	-341,200	+20,000
Use of balances from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements.....	---	---	100,000	+100,000	+100,000
Subtotal, Clean water state revolving fund....	1,091,200	730,000	850,000	-241,200	+120,000
Infrastructure assistance: Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF).....	843,200	850,000	850,000	+6,800	---
Infrastructure assistance: Mexico border.....	49,600	50,000	50,000	+400	---
Infrastructure assistance: Puerto Rico.....	3,849	4,000	4,000	+151	---
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance.....	2,032,489	1,649,000	1,769,000	-263,489	+120,000
STAG infrastructure grants / Congressional priorities.	309,548	---	200,000	-109,548	+200,000
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (excluding categorical grants).....	2,438,757	1,779,500	2,074,500	-364,257	+295,000

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					

Categorical grants					
Categorical grant: Beaches protection.....	9,920	10,000	10,000	+80	---
Categorical grant: Brownfields.....	49,600	60,000	52,000	+2,400	-8,000
Categorical grant: Environmental information.....	19,344	20,000	20,000	+656	---
Categorical grant: Hazardous waste financial assistance.....	103,466	104,400	104,400	+934	---
Categorical grant: Homeland security.....	4,960	5,000	5,000	+40	---
Categorical grant: Lead.....	13,392	13,700	13,700	+308	---
Categorical grant: Nonpoint source (Sec. 319).....	207,328	209,100	209,100	+1,772	---
Categorical grant: Pesticides enforcement.....	19,344	18,900	18,900	-444	---
Categorical grant: Pesticides program implementation.....	12,896	13,100	13,100	+204	---
Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106) Pollution control (Sec. 106) (other activities)...	168,620	177,900	169,900	+1,280	-8,000
Water quality monitoring.....	39,700	54,000	54,000	+14,300	---

Subtotal, Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106).....	208,320	231,900	223,900	+15,580	-8,000
Categorical grant: Pollution prevention.....	4,960	6,000	5,000	+40	-1,000
Categorical grant: Public water system supervision.	99,746	100,600	100,600	+854	---
Categorical grant: Radon.....	6,944	8,150	8,150	+1,206	---
Categorical grant: Sector program.....	2,232	2,250	2,250	+18	---
Categorical grant: State and local air quality management.....	223,200	223,550	223,550	+350	---
Categorical grant: State and tribal performance fund.....	---	23,000	---	---	-23,000
Categorical grant: Targeted watersheds.....	17,856	15,000	15,000	-2,856	---
Categorical grant: Toxics substances compliance....	5,007	5,150	5,150	+143	---
Categorical grant: Tribal air quality management....	10,743	11,050	11,050	+307	---

	(dollars in thousands)				Recommended versus Request
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Recommended	Enacted	
Categorical grant: Tribal general assistance program.....	61,504	57,500	57,500	-4,004	---
Categorical grant: Underground injection control....	10,694	11,000	11,000	+306	---
Categorical grant: Underground storage tanks.....	11,904	11,950	11,950	+46	---
Categorical grant: Wastewater operator training.....	1,488	---	---	-1,488	---
Categorical grant: Water quality cooperative agreements.....	16,864	---	15,000	-1,864	+15,000
Categorical grant: Wetlands program development....	14,880	20,000	17,000	+2,120	-3,000
Subtotal, Categorical grants.....	1,136,592	1,181,300	1,153,300	+16,708	-28,000
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants....	3,575,349	2,960,800	3,227,800	-347,549	+267,000
Rescission of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements (various EPA accounts).....	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,575,349	2,960,800	3,127,800	-447,549	+167,000

The Committee recommends \$3,127,800,000 for State and tribal assistance grants, a decrease of \$447,549,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level and \$167,000,000 above the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

Brownfields.—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$25,000,000 for Brownfields projects. The Committee recommended level represents an increase of more than \$6,000,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level.

Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water State Revolving Fund.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$120,000,000 for the clean water State revolving funds, including the use of \$100,000,000 rescinded from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements from various EPA appropriation accounts.

State and Tribal Infrastructure Grants/Congressional priorities.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$200,000,000 for targeted STAG infrastructure grants. These specific grants will be designated in conference action on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Act, 2006.

Categorical Grants.—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$28,000,000 for categorical grants, including decreases of \$8,000,000 for Brownfields, \$8,000,000 for pollution control (section 106), \$1,000,000 for pollution prevention, \$23,000,000 for a new State and tribal performance fund, and \$3,000,000 for wetlands program development and an increase of \$15,000,000 for water quality cooperative agreements.

Bill Language.—The Committee recommends bill language stipulating that funds associated with STAG special projects, from fiscal year 2000 or earlier, that have not received an approved grant by the end of fiscal year 2006 will be transferred to the appropriate State's Drinking Water or Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Bill language also provides for the transfer of funds, not needed for STAG projects, to the appropriate State's Drinking Water or Clean Water Revolving Fund (i.e., unused funds from completed projects or funds from projects that are determined to be ineligible for a grant).

The Committee also recommends the rescission of \$100,000,000 in balances from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements from various EPA appropriation accounts and the use of these funds, as an additional amount of \$100,000,000, for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

The Committee also recommends bill language granting authority to EPA to make technical corrections on special project infrastructure grants subject to Committee consultation.

The Committee has also included bill language, as requested by the Administration and as carried in previous appropriations acts, to: (1) extend for an additional year the authority for States to transfer funds between the Clean Water SRF and the Drinking Water SRF; (2) waive the one-third of 1 percent cap on the Tribal set aside from non-point source grants; (3) increase to 1.5 percent the cap on the Tribal set-aside for the Clean Water SRF; and (4) require that any funds provided to address the water infrastructure needs of colonias within the United States along the United States-Mexico border be spent only in areas where the local governmental entity has established an enforceable ordinance or rule which pre-

vents additional development within colonias that lack water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure.

Bill language has been included stipulating that, consistent with section 603 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$50,000,000 of the \$850,000,000 proposed for the Clean Water SRF program is to be made available by the States for interest-free loans to increase non-point and non-structural, decentralized alternatives and expand the choices available to communities for clean water improvements. The Committee continues to support this program.

While no specific special project grants are identified at this point for fiscal year 2006 as in past years, targeted grants shall be accompanied by a cost-share requirement whereby 45 percent of a project's cost is the responsibility of the community or entity receiving the grant. In those few cases where such cost-share requirement poses a particular financial burden on the recipient community or entity, the Committee supports the Agency's use of its long-standing guidance for financial capability assessments to determine reductions or waivers from this match requirement. Except for the limited instances in which an applicant meets the criteria for a waiver, the Committee has provided no more than 55% of an individual project's cost, regardless of the amount appropriated.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. No STAG technical correction may be made without advance consultation with the Committee. The EPA should report to the Committee within 30 days of the close of each fiscal year with a list of the technical corrections it has made to STAG special project infrastructure grants during that fiscal year and on funds transferred from projects to the drinking water and clean water SRFs.

2. As in past years, from within the Committee's \$50,000,000 recommendation for the United States-Mexico Border program, the Agency is expected to continue the Brownsville, Texas area water supply project, and the El Paso, Texas area desalination and water supply project.

3. With respect to financial assistance from State Revolving Funds, States should give priority to projects that use best management practices that provide cost savings and increased efficiency.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee has included bill language, requested by the Administration and supported by the Science Committee, permitting EPA to hire no more than 5 senior level scientists using expedited procedures. This authority is similar to that provided to the National Institutes of Health.

The Committee has, again this year, included an administrative provision giving the Administrator specific authority, in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, to award cooperative agreements to Federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia so as to properly carry out EPA's environmental programs.

opening of the museum, appropriated funds have been provided to pay for the ongoing operating costs of the museum as authorized by Public Law 102–529 and Public Law 106–292.

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$40,858,000
Budget estimate, 2006	43,233,000
Recommended, 2006	41,880,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+1,022,000
Budget estimate, 2006	–1,353,000

The Committee recommends \$41,880,000 for the Holocaust Memorial Museum, a decrease of \$1,353,000 below the budget request and \$1,022,000 above the enacted level. This increase is 2.5% above the enacted funding level. The Committee encourages the Council to keep the Committee informed of substantive work plan changes and to inform the Committee if there is a need to move maintenance funds to repair damages to the Ross office building.

PRESIDIO TRUST

PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$19,722,000
Budget estimate, 2006	20,000,000
Recommended, 2006	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+278,000
Budget estimate, 2006	0

The Committee recommends \$20,000,000 for the Presidio Trust fund, the same as the budget request and \$278,000 above the enacted level.

WHITE HOUSE COMMISSION ON THE NATIONAL MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2005	\$248,000
Budget estimate, 2006	250,000
Recommended, 2006	250,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+2,000
Budget estimate, 2006	0

The White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, established by Public Law 106–579, was created to (1) sustain the American spirit through acts of remembrance, not only on Memorial Day, but throughout the year; (2) institutionalize the National Moment of Remembrance; and (3) to enhance the commemoration and understanding of Memorial Day. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$250,000, an increase of \$2,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the level requested by the President.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 401 continues a provision providing for public availability of information on consulting services contracts.

Section 402 continues a provision prohibiting activities to promote public support or opposition to legislative proposals.

Section 403 continues a provision providing for annual appropriations unless expressly provided otherwise in this Act.

Section 404 continues a provision limiting the use of personal cooks, chauffeurs or servants.

Section 405 provides for restrictions on departmental assessments unless approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

Section 406 continues a provision limiting the sale of giant sequoia.

Section 407 continues a limitation on accepting and processing applications for patents and on the patenting of Federal lands; permits processing of grandfathered applications; and permits third-party contractors to process grandfathered applications.

Section 408 continues a provision limiting payments for contract support costs in past years to the funds available in law and accompanying report language in those years for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

Section 409 continues a provision specifying reforms and limitations dealing with the National Endowment for the Arts.

Section 410 continues a provision permitting the collection and use of private funds by the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Section 411 continues direction to the National Endowment for the Arts on funding distribution.

Section 412 continues a limitation on completing and issuing the five-year program under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

Section 413 continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds to support government-wide administrative functions unless they are justified in the budget process and approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Section 414 continues a provision permitting the Forest Service to use the roads and trails fund for backlog maintenance and priority forest health treatments.

Section 415 continues a provision limiting the use of answering machines during core business hours except in case of emergency and requires an option of talking to a person. The American taxpayer deserves to receive personal attention from public servants.

Section 416 continues a provision clarifying the Forest Service land management planning revision requirements.

Section 417 continues a provision limiting preleasing, leasing, and related activities within the boundaries of National monuments.

Section 418 extends the Forest Service Conveyances Pilot Program.

Section 419 continues a provision providing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign nations concerning the personal liability of firefighters.

Section 420 continues a provision prohibiting the transfer of funds to other agencies other than provided in this Act.

Section 421 continues a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to give consideration to rural communities, local and non-profit groups, and disadvantaged workers in entering into contracts for hazardous fuels and watershed projects.

Section 422 continues a provision limiting the use of funds for filing declarations of takings or condemnations. This provision does not apply to the Everglades National Park Protection and Environmental Act.

Section 423 provides guidance on competitive sourcing activities and clarifies annual reporting requirements to specify the reporting of the full costs associated with sourcing studies and related activities. Language is also included concerning the Forest Service so the problems associated with the previous, faulty competitive sourcing studies are not repeated in the future.

Section 424 requires overhead charges, deductions, reserves or holdbacks to be presented in annual budget justifications, with changes presented to the Appropriations Committees for approval.

Section 425 prohibits the expenditure of funds on Safecom and Disaster Management.

Section 426 limits contracts for the operation of the National Recreational Reservation Center.

Section 427 enhances Forest Service administration of rights-of-way and land uses.

Section 428 extends the authorization for the Service First program.

Section 429 allows the Secretary of Agriculture to complete an exchange of a leasehold interest at the San Bernardino International Airport for lands and buildings located adjacent to the former Norton Air Force Base in California. This exchange will allow the Secretary to relocate the forest supervisor's office of the San Bernardino National Forest into buildings owned by the United States, which will result in lease cost savings and improved service to the public.

Section 430 requires a report of the expenditure of funds pursuant to the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act.

Section 431 continues a legislative provision limiting funds for oil and gas leasing or permitting on the Finger Lakes National Forest, NY.

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2), rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

<i>Department and activity</i>	<i>Amounts recommended for rescission</i>
Department of the Interior: Land and Water Conservation Fund (contract authority)	\$30,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency: various accounts (rescissions are under State and Tribal Assistance Grants heading)	100,000,000

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2), rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the transfers of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

APPROPRIATION TRANSFERS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Account from which transfer is to be made	Amount	Account to which transfer is to be made	Amount
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Wildland Fire Management.	\$9,000,000	Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	\$9,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	13,536,000	Office of Inspector General	13,536,000
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	30,605,000	Science and Technology	30,605,000
Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	9,000,000	Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Wildland Fire Management.	9,000,000

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following Statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill, which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law. In most instances these provisions have been included in prior appropriations Acts.

The Bill includes the following changes in application of existing law:

Overall Bill

Providing that certain appropriations remain available until expended or extends the availability of funds beyond the fiscal year where programs or projects are continuing but for which legislation does not specifically authorize such extended availability. This authority tends to result in savings by preventing the practice of committing funds on low priority projects at the end of the fiscal year to avoid losing the funds.

Limiting, in certain instances, the obligation of funds for particular functions or programs. These limitations include restrictions on the obligation of funds for administrative expenses, travel expenses, the use of consultants, and programmatic areas within the overall jurisdiction of a particular agency.

Limiting official entertainment or reception and representation expenses for selected agencies in the bill.

Continuing ongoing activities of those Federal agencies, which require annual authorization or additional legislation, which has not been enacted.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Permitting the use of receipts from the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

Providing funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation under certain conditions.

Permitting the use of fees from communication site rentals.

Permitting the collection of fees for processing mining applications and for certain public land uses.

Permitting the use of mining fee collections for program operations.

Providing for a Youth Conservation Corp.

Prohibiting fee exemptions for non-local traffic through National Parks.

Permitting the transfer of funds between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.

Providing for administrative law judges to handle Indian probate issues.

Permitting the redistribution of certain Indian funds with limitations.

Directing allocation of funds for Bureau of Indian Affairs funded postsecondary schools.

Permitting the conveyance of the Twin Cities Research Center. Allowing the use of helicopters and motor vehicles on Sheldon and Hart National Wildlife Refuges.

Authorizing funding transfers for Shenandoah Valley Battlefield NHD and Ice Age NST.

Prohibiting the closure of the underground lunchroom at Carlsbad Caverns NP.

Prohibiting demolition of the bridge between New Jersey and Ellis Island.

Limiting compensation for the Special Master and Court Monitor for the Cobell v. Norton litigation.

Allowing payment of attorney fees for Federal employees related to the Cobell v. Norton litigation.

Requiring the Fish and Wildlife Service to mark hatchery salmon.

Allowing for the transfer of certain Departmental Management funds to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the Midway Island refuge airport.

Addressing the use of certain Indian lands for gaming purposes.

Preventing funds to study or reduce the water level at Lake Powell.

Limiting the amount of fees that may be collected by the National Indian Gaming Commission.

Providing for a tribal trust demonstration program.

Providing for the renewal of certain grazing permits in the Jarbidge Field office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Authorizing the acquisition of lands and leases for Ellis Island.

Permitting the Secretary of the Interior to issue grazing permits within the Mojave National Preserve.

Implementing rules concerning winter snowmobile use at Yellowstone National Park.

Limiting staff and funding for the Department of the Interior, Office of Law Enforcement and Security.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

Providing for the allocation of funds to other Federal agencies under certain circumstances.

Providing for the transfer of funds within certain agency accounts.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Providing for grants to State, Tribal, and local governments for school bus services, pollution prevention, particulate matter monitoring, and for environmental information exchange grants.

Providing for State authority under Public Law 104–182.

Exempting limitations on State administration expenses at the discretion of the Administrator.

Providing for administrative expenses for the State Revolving Fund.

Limiting funding for certain United States—Mexico border programs under certain conditions.

Providing for the transfer of special project funds, unawarded after 7 years, to the appropriate State Revolving Funds.

Providing that excess funds from completed special projects or from projects determined to be ineligible for a grant be deposited in State Revolving Funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Allowing awards of grants to federally recognized Indian tribes.

Authorizing the collection of pesticide registration service fees.

Providing funds for grants and loans under CERCLA.

Permitting the Administrator to make up to five scientist appointments to the Office of Research and Development.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

FOREST SERVICE

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Deriving forest legacy funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Requiring notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee before releasing forest legacy project funds.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Allowing 50 percent of the fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to remain available until expended.

Requiring the budget justification to display unobligated balances available at the start of fiscal year.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

Allowing the use of wildland fire funds to repay advances from other accounts.

Allowing reimbursement of States for certain wildfire emergency activities.

Requiring 50 percent of any unobligated balances remaining at the end of fiscal year 2005, except hazardous fuels funding, to be transferred to the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund as repayment for past advances.

Permitting the use of funds for the joint fire science program.

Permitting the use of forest and rangeland research funds for fire science research.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE HONORABLE DAVID OBEY

As the Ranking Minority Member of the Appropriations Committee, I cannot fault the fairness of the process followed by our Committee in producing the fiscal year 2006 Interior Appropriations bill. Minority Members were consulted throughout the process and the bill reflects our input in a number of important areas. But a fair process by itself does not produce an acceptable product. This bill's principal responsibility is to provide for the environmental and conservation needs of America's people and its natural resources. Notwithstanding increases in a few critical areas, the FY 2006 Interior bill as currently presented simply does not fulfill that responsibility. Because of these failures, American families will be exposed unnecessarily to dirtier water and air and to the poisons of toxic Superfund sites. Because of its failures, many of America's pristine natural landscapes and historic structures, as well as the variety of its wildlife, may be lost to future generations.

The Interior bill's failings did not occur by accident. The overall lack of funds to address national needs is the direct and inevitable result of the vote cast last month to approve a Republican Budget Resolution for 2006 that provides \$11.7 billion less than the amount necessary just to maintain current service levels for domestic programs. As Majority Leader Tom Delay pointed out last month during debate on the Conference Report on the Budget Resolution,

This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November.

After Republicans voted 218-12 in favor of a Budget Resolution with inadequate resources for domestic programs, I believe it is disingenuous for them to defend the Interior appropriations bill by saying, "We did the best we could with an inadequate allocation." The Republican Members had a choice and they voted for the discretionary spending total which they now say forces these destructive choices. Not one Democrat voted for the current Budget Resolution because we understood the damage to essential services which it would cause. The 2006 Interior bill now presented to the House epitomizes the draconian results of the Republican fiscal philosophy which espouses super-sized tax cuts for the most well-off over critical priorities like protecting the environment.

Among the many failings of the Interior bill reported by the Committee, the most destructive are its severe reductions in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). I am especially disturbed that the Interior Subcommittee, without a single hearing, has recommended cutting the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by \$242 million below the 2005 funding level. This program serves every state and almost every community in this country. But, without a word of testimony by the EPA or affected communities, the Committee has cut the Clean Water Fund by more than 20 percent this year and by almost 40 percent over the last two years. If the Interior bill is approved as currently drafted, the \$850 million provided in 2006 will be the lowest level of new capital assistance for this revolving fund since 1989. Majority Leader Delay was right.

This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November.

The need for investment in this country's water systems is well documented and enormous. Two years ago EPA Administrator Whitman issued a formal report, entitled the "Water Gap Analysis," which estimated the twenty-year fiscal shortfall between what we are currently spending and what is required at \$388 billion. Everyone agrees that the Clean Water SRF program works. Over the last 16 years \$21 billion of appropriations for the Clean Water SRF have generated \$52 billion of construction projects in every state and in literally thousands of communities.

The impact of the cut to the SRF recommended in the current bill on local communities will be very visible. Projects that have already been approved by State water authorities for future funding will, inevitably, be rejected, scaled back, or substantially delayed. A table showing the impact of these cuts to each state is included at the end of these remarks. As Members review this table for its impact on their own states, they should remember Majority Leader Delay's prescient statement last month,

This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November.

I am also very concerned by the decision reflected in this bill to reduce funding for environmental enforcement activities of the EPA by \$12 million. I wish that every private company, every public utility company and every community water and sewer authority would willingly comply with the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. I wish every industrial polluter who had dumped toxic PCB's and other chemicals into our rivers or buried them in dumps outside their factories would enthusiastically clean up their Superfund sites. Unfortunately, 35 years of experience has taught us that aggressive enforcement is needed if we are to get compliance with our environmental laws. Enforcement has resulted in settlements with coal burning power plants that have cut emissions of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides by nearly a million tons, reducing asthma attacks, lung disease and acid rain. Compliance agreements or enforcement orders with water and sewer authorities in cities across the United States have prevented billions of gallons of raw sewage from seeping into water supplies by requiring installation of upgrades at treatment plants. Members should not be surprised by these cutbacks in important environmental enforcement activities because Majority Delay was candid when he told us,

This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November.

Not all the cuts in this bill are an artifact of it's allocation. Some reflect ideological positions of the Subcommittee Chairman with which I very much disagree. In my opinion, the Chairman's recommendation to eliminate \$190 million of Land and Water Conservation funding, including funding for all new federal land acquisitions as well as all assistance to States, is a mistake for the country and for the Congress. The American people recognize the need

to preserve the remaining natural landscapes of this country for future generations. Those of us who visit our national parks and refuges know how precious they are. Five years ago 315 members of the House voted to make these programs an entitlement under the CARA bill because Congress didn't keep its word to adequately fund conservation programs. The Subcommittee Chairman certainly has a right to his sincerely held views regarding land conservation programs, but I do not believe that his recommendation to eliminate all funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as reflected in this bill, represents the will of the House.

As I have noted throughout these remarks, these failings did not occur by accident. The Majority Leader of the House, Tom Delay, explained the reason for these cuts last month on the floor when the House adopted the Budget Resolution for 2006.

This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November.

The FY 2006 Interior bill as reported to the House is not a bill that I believe Members of Congress can go home and tell people with a straight face, "We did the right thing."

I will not vote for it.

Allocations for \$1.35 billion, \$1.09 billion, and \$850 million in Clean Water State Revolving Fund Appropriations

May 4, 2005

State or Region	Percent (%) Under Current Formula(1)	FY 04 \$1.35 Billion	FY05 \$1.09 Billion	FY 06 Committee Mark \$850 million	FY 06 Committee vs FY 05	FY 06 Committee vs. FY 04
Alabama	1.15	15,057,642	12,183,016	9,489,462	-2,693,554	-5,568,180
Alaska	0.62	8,059,414	6,520,807	5,079,116	-1,441,691	-2,980,298
Arizona	0.69	9,095,301	7,358,935	5,731,941	-1,626,994	-3,363,360
Arkansas	0.67	8,809,034	7,127,318	5,551,533	-1,575,785	-3,257,501
California	7.36	96,309,528	77,923,261	60,695,136	-17,228,125	-35,614,392
Colorado	0.82	10,771,627	8,715,236	6,788,377	-1,926,860	-3,983,250
Connecticut	1.26	16,496,966	13,347,562	10,396,537	-2,951,025	-6,100,429
Delaware	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
District of Columbia	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Florida	3.47	45,455,200	36,777,435	28,646,278	-8,131,157	-16,808,922
Georgia	1.74	22,768,210	18,421,575	14,348,732	-4,072,843	-8,419,478
Hawaii	0.80	10,429,438	8,438,374	6,572,726	-1,865,648	-3,856,712
Idaho	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Illinois	4.65	60,902,964	49,276,096	38,381,599	-10,894,497	-22,521,365
Indiana	2.48	32,453,354	26,257,746	20,452,397	-5,805,349	-12,000,957
Iowa	1.39	18,225,220	14,745,878	11,485,699	-3,260,180	-6,739,521
Kansas	0.93	12,155,029	9,834,536	7,660,209	-2,174,326	-4,494,820
Kentucky	1.31	17,138,737	13,866,814	10,800,987	-3,065,826	-6,337,750
Louisiana	1.13	14,803,331	11,977,255	9,329,193	-2,648,062	-5,474,138
Maine	0.80	10,424,112	8,434,065	6,569,370	-1,864,695	-3,854,742
Maryland	2.49	32,568,192	26,351,470	20,525,400	-5,826,070	-12,043,792
Massachusetts	3.49	45,720,163	36,991,814	28,813,260	-8,178,554	-16,906,903
Michigan	4.42	57,901,821	46,847,895	36,490,252	-10,357,644	-21,411,569
Minnesota	1.89	24,750,775	20,025,652	15,598,162	-4,427,490	-9,152,613
Mississippi	0.93	12,132,393	9,816,221	7,645,944	-2,170,277	-4,486,449
Missouri	2.85	37,330,544	30,203,841	23,526,047	-6,677,795	-13,804,497
Montana	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Nebraska	0.53	6,887,716	5,572,795	4,340,701	-1,232,094	-2,547,015
Nevada	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
New Hampshire	1.03	13,457,210	10,888,120	8,480,856	-2,407,264	-4,976,354
New Jersey	4.20	55,028,500	44,523,115	34,679,459	-9,843,656	-20,349,041

Allocations for \$1.35 billion, \$1.09 billion, and \$850 million in Clean Water State Revolving Fund Appropriations

May 4, 2005

State or Region	Percent (%) Under Current Formula(1)	FY 04 \$1.35 Billion	FY05 \$1.09 Billion	FY 06 Committee Mark \$850 million	FY 06 Committee vs FY 05	FY 06 Committee vs. FY 04
New Mexico	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
New York	11.36	148,635,134	120,259,486	93,671,207	-26,588,279	-54,963,927
North Carolina	1.86	24,303,400	19,663,665	15,316,223	-4,347,462	-8,987,177
North Dakota	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Ohio	5.79	75,808,818	61,336,302	47,775,403	-13,560,899	-28,033,415
Oklahoma	0.83	10,879,476	8,802,496	6,856,344	-1,946,152	-4,023,132
Oregon	1.16	15,212,093	12,307,981	9,586,799	-2,721,183	-5,625,294
Pennsylvania	4.08	53,341,522	43,158,194	33,616,310	-9,541,884	-19,725,212
Rhode Island	0.69	9,042,042	7,315,843	5,698,377	-1,617,466	-3,343,665
South Carolina	1.05	13,795,405	11,161,751	8,693,989	-2,467,762	-5,101,416
South Dakota	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Tennessee	1.49	19,562,020	15,827,472	12,328,162	-3,499,310	-7,233,858
Texas	4.70	61,548,729	49,798,579	38,788,566	-11,010,013	-22,760,163
Texas	0.54	7,095,426	5,740,852	4,471,602	-1,269,250	-2,623,824
Utah	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Vermont	2.11	27,558,854	22,297,646	17,367,839	-4,929,807	-10,191,015
Virginia	1.79	23,417,969	18,947,289	14,758,216	-4,189,073	-8,659,753
Washington	1.60	20,992,023	16,984,476	13,229,363	-3,755,113	-7,762,660
West Virginia	2.78	36,405,169	29,455,128	22,942,867	-6,512,261	-13,462,302
Wisconsin	0.51	6,610,770	5,348,721	4,166,167	-1,182,553	-2,444,603
Wyoming						
U.S. Total (2)	100.00	1,308,839,201	1,058,971,219	824,842,310	-234,128,910	-483,996,891

Percent Change
FY 06 Committee vs. FY 04
-37%

(1) The percentages listed for each state's share of program funding are based on program dollars for the states only and thus will differ slightly from shares calculated based on total program funding for the states, Indian Tribes, Puerto Rico, and the territories.

(2) U.S. totals do not include amounts for Indian Tribes, Puerto Rico, or the territories, which account for about 3.05 percent of the total appropriations. The totals include 604(b) funds for water management planning. U.S. total for the \$1.06 billion level assumes a \$1.1 billion appropriation and an across the board reduction in federal spending overall of 0.83%, for a total of \$1.09 billion. Source: American Rivers calculations based on data from Northeast-Midwest Institute and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Wastewater Management, March 2002.

Calendar No. 125

109TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
109-80

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND
RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2006

JUNE 10, 2005—Ordered to be printed

Filed, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 2005

Mr. BURNS, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2361]

The Committee on Appropriations to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Amounts in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2006

Amount of bill passed by House	\$26,159,125,000
Amount of increase by Senate	99,500,000
<hr/>	
Total of bill as reported to Senate	26,258,625,000
Estimates considered by House	25,724,328,000
Estimates considered by Senate	25,724,328,000
Above the budget estimate, 2006	534,297,000
Below appropriations, 2005 (including emer- gencies)	739,099,000

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Bill	4
Revenue Generated by Agencies in Bill	4
Major Changes Recommended in the Bill	5
Land and Water Conservation Fund	6
Reprogramming Guidelines	6
Title I—Department of the Interior:	
Land and Water Resources: Bureau of Land Management	9
Fish and Wildlife and Parks:	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	14
National Park Service	22
Energy and Minerals:	
U.S. Geological Survey	33
Minerals Management Service	37
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	39
Indian Affairs: Bureau of Indian Affairs	40
Departmental Offices:	
Insular Affairs	45
Departmental Management	47
Working Capital Fund	48
Payment in Lieu of Taxes	48
Central Hazardous Materials Fund	48
Office of the Solicitor	49
Office of Inspector General	49
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	49
Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration	50
Title II—Environmental Protection Agency:	
Science and Technology	55
Environmental Programs and Management	57
Office of Inspector General	61
Buildings and Facilities	62
Hazardous Substance Superfund	62
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	64
Oil Spill Response	65
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	65
Administrative Provisions	74
Title III—Related agencies:	
Department of Agriculture: Forest Service	75
Administrative Provisions, Forest Service	89
Department of Health and Human Services:	
Indian Health Service	89
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	93
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	93
Other Related Agencies:	
Council on Environmental Quality	94
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	94
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	95
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	95
Smithsonian Institution	96
National Gallery of Art	99
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	100
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	101
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities: National Endowment for the Arts	102

	Page
Title III—Related agencies—Continued	
Other Related Agencies—Continued	
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities—Continued	
National Endowment for the Humanities	103
Commission of Fine Arts	104
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	105
National Capital Planning Commission	106
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum	107
Presidio Trust	107
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remem- brance	108
Title IV—General provisions	109
Title V—Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act	112
Compliance with Paragraph 7, Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Sen- ate	114
Compliance with Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	114
Compliance with Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	115

SUMMARY OF BILL

For this bill, estimates totaling \$25,724,328,000 in new obligational authority were considered by the Committee for the programs and activities of the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, except the Bureau of Reclamation, and the following related agencies:

- Environmental Protection Agency.
- Department of Agriculture:
 - Forest Service.
- Department of Health and Human Services:
 - Indian Health Service.
 - National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.
 - Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.
- Council on Environmental Quality.
- Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.
- Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.
- Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.
- Smithsonian Institution.
- National Gallery of Art.
- John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.
- Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:
 - National Endowment for the Arts.
 - National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Commission of Fine Arts.
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
- National Capital Planning Commission.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.
- Presidio Trust.
- White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance.

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

Oil and gas leasing and other mineral leasing recreation and user fees, the timber and range programs, and other activities are estimated to generate income to the Government of \$13,865,597,000 in fiscal year 2006. These estimated receipts, for agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction, are tabulated below:

Item	Fiscal year—		
	2004	2005	2006
Department of the Interior	\$9,643,359,000	\$12,497,212,000	\$13,418,547,000
Forest Service	445,533,000	439,106,000	447,050,000
Total receipts	10,088,892,000	12,936,318,000	13,865,597,000

MAJOR CHANGES RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

The Committee has developed revisions to the budget estimate for the 2006 fiscal year.

A comparative summary of funding in the bill by agency is shown by agency or principal program in the following table:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared with budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bureau of Land Management	1,759,042	1,788,310	+ 29,268
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1,322,894	1,315,037	– 7,857
National Park Service	2,249,275	2,313,332	+ 64,057
United States Geological Survey	933,515	963,057	+ 29,542
Minerals Management Service	167,422	159,522	– 7,900
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	356,549	298,549	– 58,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	2,187,469	2,269,371	+ 81,902
Departmental Offices	815,903	770,563	– 45,340
Total, Title I—Department of the Interior	9,792,069	9,877,741	+ 85,672
TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
Science and Technology	760,640	730,795	– 29,845
Environmental Programs and Management	2,353,764	2,333,416	– 20,348
Office of Inspector General	36,955	36,955
Building and Facilities	40,218	40,218
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,279,333	1,256,165	– 23,168
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	73,027	73,027
Oil Spill Response	15,863	15,863
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,960,800	3,395,550	+ 434,750
Total, Title II—Environmental Protection Agency	7,520,600	7,881,989	+ 361,389
TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES			
Department of Agriculture: Forest Service	4,065,000	4,122,767	+ 57,767
Department of Health and Human Services:			
Indian Health Service	3,047,966	3,067,966	+ 20,000
National Institutes of Health: National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	80,289	80,289
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	76,024	76,024
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality ..	2,717	2,717
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	9,200	9,200
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	8,601	8,601
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	6,300	6,300
Smithsonian Institution	615,035	624,135	+ 9,100
National Gallery of Art	113,300	111,600	– 1,700
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	33,000	33,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	9,201	9,201
National Endowment for the Arts	121,264	126,264	+ 5,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	138,054	143,054	+ 5,000
Commission of Fine Arts	1,893	1,893
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,000	7,492	+ 492
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	4,988	4,943	– 45
National Capital Planning Commission	8,344	8,244	– 100
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum	43,233	43,233
Presidio Trust	20,000	19,722	– 278
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance	250	250
Total, Title III—Related Agencies	8,411,659	8,506,895	+ 95,236

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared with budget estimate
GRAND TOTAL	25,724,328	26,266,625	+ 542,297

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

The following table displays appropriations for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Agency/Program	Fiscal year		House recommendation	Committee recommendation
	2005 enacted	2006 estimate ¹		
Federal Land Acquisition:				
Bureau of Land Management	\$11,192,000	\$13,350,000	\$3,817,000	\$12,250,000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	37,005,000	40,992,000	14,937,000	40,827,000
National Park Service	55,134,000	52,880,000	7,834,000	56,005,000
Forest Service	61,007,000	40,000,000	15,000,000	44,925,000
Departmental Management (appraisal services) ²			[7,441,000]	7,441,000
Subtotal, Federal Land Acquisition	164,338,000	147,222,000	41,588,000	161,448,000
National Park Service, State Assistance	91,215,000	1,587,000	1,587,000	30,000,000
Landowner Incentive Program	21,694,000	40,000,000	23,700,000	25,000,000
Private Stewardship Grants	6,903,000	10,000,000	7,386,000	7,500,000
State and Tribal Wildlife Grants	69,028,000	74,000,000	65,000,000	72,000,000
Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund ³	48,698,000	45,653,000	50,053,000	45,653,000
Forest Legacy	57,134,000	80,000,000	25,000,000	62,632,000
Total, Land and Water Conservation Fund	459,010,000	398,492,000	214,314,000	404,233,000

¹ 2006 estimate reflects only activities for which funds were derived from the LWCF in fiscal year 2005.

² Funded in bureau land acquisition accounts in fiscal year 2005 and prior years.

³ CESCO data only reflects funding for HCP land acquisition.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee has revised the reprogramming guidelines to add an exception for certain Environmental Protection Agency grants (section 3(b)) and to delete certain instructions to the Forest Service dealing with boundary adjustments and transfer of funds.

The following are the procedures governing reprogramming actions for programs and activities funded in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act:

1. *Definition.*—“Reprogramming,” as defined in these procedures, includes the reallocation of funds from one budget activity to another. In cases where either the House or Senate Committee report displays an allocation of an appropriation below the activity level, that more detailed level shall be the basis for reprogramming. For construction accounts, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project (identified in the justification or Committee report) to another. A reprogramming shall also consist of any significant departure from the program described in the agency’s budget justifications. This includes proposed reorganizations even without a change in funding.

2. *Guidelines for Reprogramming.*—(a) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises; and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appro-

priation year would result in actual loss or damage. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

(b) Any project or activity, which may be deferred through reprogramming, shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming; but, instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through the regular appropriations process.

(c) Reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited or increased by the Congress in the Act or the report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee, regardless of amounts involved, and be fully explained and justified.

(d) Reprogramming proposals submitted to the Committee for approval shall be considered approved 30 calendar days after receipt if the Committee has posed no objection. However, agencies will be expected to extend the approval deadline if specifically requested by either Committee.

(e) Proposed changes to estimated working capital fund bills and estimated overhead charges, deductions, reserves or holdbacks, as such estimates were presented in annual budget justifications, shall be submitted through the reprogramming process.

3. *Criteria and Exceptions.*—Any proposed reprogramming must be submitted to the Committee in writing prior to implementation if it exceeds \$500,000 annually or results in an increase or decrease of more than 10 percent annually in affected programs, with the following exceptions:

(a) With regard to the tribal priority allocations activity of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operations of Indian Programs account, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among the programs within this activity. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during the first 6 months of the fiscal year by no later than May 1 of each year, and shall provide a final report of all reprogrammings for the previous fiscal year by no later than November 1 of each year.

(b) With regard to the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants account, reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for partnership grants do not need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations. In addition, the Agency need not submit a request to move funds between wastewater and drinking water objectives for those grants targeted to specific communities.

4. *Quarterly Reports.*—(a) All reprogrammings shall be reported to the Committee quarterly and shall include cumulative totals.

(b) Any significant shifts of funding among object classifications also should be reported to the Committee.

5. *Administrative Overhead Accounts.*—For all appropriations where costs of overhead administrative expenses are funded in part from “assessments” of various budget activities within an appropriation, the assessments shall be shown in justifications under the discussion of administrative expenses.

6. *Contingency Accounts.*—For all appropriations where assessments are made against various budget activities or allocations for

contingencies the Committee expects a full explanation, as part of the budget justification, consistent with section 405 of this Act. The explanation shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the fund. The Committee expects reports each year detailing the use of these funds. In no case shall a fund be used to finance projects and activities disapproved or limited by Congress or to finance new permanent positions or to finance programs or activities that could be foreseen and included in the normal budget review process. Contingency funds shall not be used to initiate new programs.

7. *Report Language.*—Any limitation, directive, or earmarking contained in either the House or Senate report which is not contradicted by the other report nor specifically denied in the conference report shall be considered as having been approved by both Houses of Congress.

8. *Assessments.*—No assessments shall be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act unless such assessments and the basis therefore are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees, in compliance with these procedures.

9. *Land Acquisitions and Forest Legacy.*—Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91-646) except for condemnations and declarations of taking, unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval in compliance with these procedures.

10. *Land Exchanges.*—Land exchanges, wherein the estimated value of the Federal lands to be exchanged is greater than \$500,000, shall not be consummated until the Committees on Appropriations have had a 30-day period in which to examine the proposed exchange.

11. *Appropriations Structure.*—The appropriation structure for any agency shall not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] was created through Executive Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, designed to consolidate certain Federal Government environmental activities into a single agency. The plan was submitted by the President to the Congress on July 8, 1970, and the Agency was established as an independent agency in the executive branch on December 2, 1970, by consolidating 15 components from 5 departments and independent agencies.

A description of EPA's pollution control programs by media follows:

Air.—The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 authorize a national program of air pollution research, regulation, prevention, and enforcement activities.

Water Quality.—The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, provides the framework for protection of the Nation's surface waters. The law recognizes that it is the primary responsibility of the States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate water pollution. The States determine the desired uses for their waters, set standards, identify current uses and, where uses are being impaired or threatened, develop plans for the protection or restoration of the designated use. They implement the plans through control programs such as permitting and enforcement, construction of municipal waste water treatment works, and nonpoint source control practices. The CWA also regulates discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands.

Drinking Water.—The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended in 1996, charges EPA with the responsibility of implementing a program to assure that the Nation's public drinking water supplies are free of contamination that may pose a human health risk, and to protect and prevent the endangerment of ground water resources which serve as drinking water supplies.

Hazardous Waste.—The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 mandated EPA to develop a regulatory program to protect human health and the environment from improper hazardous waste disposal practices. The RCRA Program manages hazardous wastes from generation through disposal.

EPA's responsibilities and authorities to manage hazardous waste were greatly expanded under the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984. Not only did the regulated universe of wastes and facilities dealing with hazardous waste increase significantly, but past mismanagement practices, in particular prior releases at inactive hazardous and solid waste management units, were to be identified and corrective action taken. The 1984 amend-

ments also authorized a regulatory and implementation program directed to owners and operators of underground storage tanks.

Pesticides.—The objective of the Pesticide Program is to protect the public health and the environment from unreasonable risks while permitting the use of necessary pest control approaches. This objective is pursued by EPA under the Food Quality Protection Act, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003 through three principal means: (1) review of existing and new pesticide products; (2) enforcement of pesticide use rules; and (3) research and development to reinforce the ability to evaluate the risks and benefits of pesticides.

Radiation.—The radiation program's major emphasis is to minimize the exposure of persons to ionizing radiation, whether from naturally occurring sources, from medical or industrial applications, nuclear power sources, or weapons development.

Toxic Substances.—The Toxic Substances Control Act establishes a program to stimulate the development of adequate data on the effects of chemical substances on health and the environment, and institute control action for those chemicals which present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The act's coverage affects more than 60,000 chemicals currently in commerce, and all new chemicals.

Multimedia.—Multimedia activities are designed to support programs where the problems, tools, and results are cross media and must be integrated to effect results. This integrated program encompasses the Agency's research, enforcement, and abatement activities.

Superfund.—The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 established a national program to protect public health and the environment from the threats posed by inactive hazardous waste sites and uncontrolled spills of hazardous substances. The original statute was amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. Under these authorities, EPA manages a hazardous waste site cleanup program including emergency response and long-term remediation.

Brownfields.—The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 as amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002 establishes a national program to assess, cleanup, and provide support to States, Tribes, local communities and other stakeholders to work together to reuse Brownfields.

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks.—The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 established the leaking underground storage tank [LUST] trust fund to conduct corrective actions for releases from leaking underground storage tanks that contain petroleum or other hazardous substances. EPA implements the LUST response program primarily through cooperative agreements with the States.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$7,881,989,000 for EPA. This is a decrease of \$144,496,000 below the fiscal year 2005 en-

acted level, an increase of \$361,389,000 above the budget request, and an increase of \$173,962,000 above the House recommendation.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriations, 2005	\$744,061,000
Budget estimate, 2006	760,640,000
House allowance	765,340,000
Committee recommendation	730,795,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

EPA's "Science and technology" account provides funding for the scientific knowledge and tools necessary to support decisions on preventing, regulating, and abating environmental pollution and to advance the base of understanding on environmental sciences. These efforts are conducted through contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements with universities, industries, other private commercial firms, nonprofit organizations, State and local governments, and Federal agencies, as well as through work performed at EPA's laboratories and various field stations and field offices. In addition, Hazardous Substance Superfund Trust Fund resources are transferred to this account directly from the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$730,795,000 for science and technology, which is \$29,845,000 below the budget request and \$13,266,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. In addition, the Committee recommends the transfer of \$30,606,000 from the Superfund account, for a total of \$761,401,000 for science and technology. Transferred funds are for ongoing research activities consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended.

Changes to the budget request are listed below.

The Committee recommends a \$619,000 decrease below the request for the Clean Air Allowance Trading program.

The Committee recommends a \$250,000 decrease below the request for Facilities Infrastructure and Operations.

The Committee recommends a \$5,131,000 decrease below the request for the Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification program.

The Committee recommends a \$38,489,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection. The Committee further recommends that \$5,585,000 in this program is allocated to the new Water Sentinel initiative.

The Committee recommends a \$15,701,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery. The Committee did not allocate funding for the laboratory preparedness and response program or the new Safe Buildings initiative.

The Committee recommends a \$1,838,000 decrease below the request for Research: Computational Toxicology.

The Committee recommends a \$1,687,000 increase above the request for Research: Endocrine Disruptor.

The Committee recommends a \$3,715,000 increase above the request for Research: Fellowships.

The Committee recommends a \$956,000 decrease below the request for Research: Global Change.

The Committee recommends a \$2,276,000 decrease below the request for Research: Human Health and Ecosystems.

The Committee recommends a \$4,631,000 decrease below the request for Research: Land Protection and Restoration.

The Committee recommends a \$9,308,000 decrease below the request for Research: Water Quality.

The Committee recommends a \$6,048,000 decrease below the request for Research: NAAQS.

In addition, the Committee recommends the following increases to the budget request:

\$1,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation;

\$2,600,000 for the Water Environment Research Foundation;

\$750,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research;

\$750,000 for the New England Green Chemistry Consortium;

\$2,100,000 for the Mine Waste Technology program at the National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center;

\$500,000 for Boise State University to continue research on multi-purpose sensors to detect and analyze contaminants and time-lapse imaging of shallow subsurface fluid flow;

\$500,000 for The Ohio State University Olentangy River Wetlands Park Teaching, Research, and Outreach Initiative;

\$500,000 for the UNC Charlotte VisualGRID;

\$500,000 for the University of Tennessee at Knoxville Natural Resources Policy Center;

\$500,000 for the University of Memphis Groundwater Institute to conduct a groundwater study;

\$800,000 for the Texas State University System Geography and Geology Project;

\$1,500,000 for the University of Louisville Lung Biology/Translational Lung Disease Program;

\$500,000 for the University of South Alabama Center for Estuarine Research;

\$500,000 for the Ohio University Consortium for Energy, Economics, and the Environment;

\$250,000 for the Center for the Study of Metals in the Environment at the University of Delaware;

\$375,000 for the Central California Ozone Study, San Joaquin Valleywide Air Pollution Study Agency;

\$2,000,000 for the National Alternative Fuels Training Consortium at West Virginia University;

\$2,000,000 for the Center for Air Toxic Metals, EERC at the University of North Dakota;

\$800,000 for the Clean Air Counts program emission reduction partnership with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency;

\$400,000 for the Missouri River Institute at the University of South Dakota;

- \$250,000 for paper industry byproduct waste reduction research in Wisconsin;
- \$500,000 for the Louisiana Smart Growth program in the State of Louisiana;
- \$500,000 for the National Environmental Respiratory Center [NERC] at the Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute in Albuquerque, New Mexico;
- \$450,000 for an environmental program at the Water Policy Institute at Texas Tech University;
- \$200,000 for a comprehensive assessment of Lake Whitney at Baylor University;
- \$250,000 for an air quality study for the Greater Houston Partnership/Houston Advanced Research Center;
- \$200,000 for a poultry science project at Stephen F. Austin State University;
- \$400,000 for Aiken Greening at the University of Vermont;
- and
- \$200,000 for the Proctor Maple Research Station in Underhill, Vermont.

The Committee recognizes the Agency’s commitment to developing a Computational Toxicology program that reduces the use of animal testing. The Committee encourages EPA to implement specific plans for validating computational toxicology methods to assure compliance with the ICCVAM Authorization Act of 2000, and requests details of these validation activities be included in the Agency’s annual Computational Toxicology report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2005	\$2,294,902,000
Budget estimate, 2006	2,353,764,000
House allowance	2,389,491,000
Committee recommendation	2,333,416,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Agency’s “Environmental programs and management” account includes the development of environmental standards; monitoring and surveillance of pollution conditions; direct Federal pollution control planning; technical assistance to pollution control agencies and organizations; preparation of environmental impact statements; enforcement and compliance assurance; and assistance to Federal agencies in complying with environmental standards and ensuring that their activities have minimal environmental impact. It provides personnel compensation, benefits, and travel and other administrative expenses for all agency programs except Hazardous Substance Superfund, LUST, Science and Technology, Oil Spill Response, and OIG.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$2,333,416,000 for environmental programs and management, \$20,348,000 below the budget request and \$38,514,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

The Committee supports the EPA Brownfields program at approximately the fiscal year 2005 enacted level of \$25,000,000 with-

in this account. The Committee notes that the inclusion of these funds in conjunction with funding of \$140,000,000 in the State and Tribal Assistance Grants account for Brownfields activities results in a total of \$165,000,000 being available in fiscal year 2006.

Changes to the budget request are listed below.

The Committee recommends a \$4,638,000 decrease below the request for the Brownfields program.

The Committee recommends a \$1,000,000 decrease below the request for the Climate Protection program. The Committee further recommends in this program that \$50,500,000 is allocated to the Energy Star program, and that \$3,000,000 is allocated for the new Methane to Markets Partnership.

The Committee recommends a \$6,084,000 decrease below the request for Compliance Monitoring.

The Committee recommends a \$1,775,000 increase above the request for Criminal Enforcement.

The Committee recommends a \$6,090,000 decrease below the request for Drinking Water Programs.

The Committee recommends a \$929,000 increase above the request for Enforcement Training.

The Committee recommends a \$7,000,000 increase above the request for Environmental Education.

The Committee recommends a \$4,739,000 decrease below the request for the Exchange Network.

The Committee recommends a \$18,046,000 decrease below the request for Facilities Infrastructure and Operations.

The Committee recommends a \$22,699,000 decrease below the request for Federal Support for Air Quality Management.

The Committee did not allocate funding for the new Clean Diesel initiative in this program.

The Committee recommends a \$841,000 decrease below the request for Federal Support for Air Toxics Program.

The Committee recommends a \$2,254,000 increase above the request for the Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay. The Committee further recommends that the increased funding in this program is allocated for Chesapeake Bay small watershed grants.

The Committee recommends a \$481,000 increase above the request for the Geographic Program: Great Lakes.

The Committee recommends a \$532,000 increase above the request for the Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico.

The Committee recommends a \$1,000,000 increase above the budget request for the Geographic Program: Lake Champlain.

The Committee recommends a \$3,349,000 decrease below the request for Geographic program: Other. The Committee did not allocate increased funding for the CARE initiative in this program. The Committee further recommends a \$1,167,000 increase for Lake Pontchartrain above the request.

The Committee recommends a \$20,000,000 decrease below the request for the Great Lakes Legacy Act.

The Committee recommends a \$1,230,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Communication and Information. The Committee did not allocate funding for the Laboratory Preparedness and Response program.

The Committee recommends a \$100,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection. The Committee did not allocate funding for the Decontamination program.

The Committee recommends a \$600,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery.

The Committee recommends a \$1,872,000 decrease below the request for Human Resources Management.

The Committee recommends a \$918,000 decrease below the request for Indoor Air: Radon.

The Committee recommends a \$1,450,000 decrease below the request for International Capacity Building.

The Committee recommends a \$12,999,000 decrease below the request for IT/Data Management.

The Committee recommends a \$1,554,000 increase above the request for the National Estuary Program/Coastal Waterways.

The Committee recommends a \$3,582,000 decrease below the request for the Pollution Prevention Program.

The Committee recommends a \$1,179,000 decrease below the request for POPS Implementation.

The Committee recommends a \$643,000 decrease below the request for Radiation: Protection.

The Committee recommends a \$12,000 decrease below the request for Radiation: Response Preparedness.

The Committee recommends a \$1,302,000 decrease below the request for Reduce Risks from Indoor Air.

The Committee recommends a \$1,862,000 decrease below the request for Regional Geographic Initiatives.

The Committee recommends a \$5,007,000 decrease below the request for Regulatory Innovation.

The Committee recommends a \$1,892,000 decrease below the request for Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis.

The Committee recommends a \$111,000 decrease below the request for Science Policy and Biotechnology.

The Committee recommends a \$473,000 decrease below the request for State and Local Prevention and Preparedness.

The Committee recommends a \$1,044,000 increase above the request for Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs.

The Committee recommends a \$5,500,000 decrease below the request for Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund.

The Committee recommends a \$4,801,000 decrease below the request for Surface Water Protection. The Committee further recommends in this program that \$4,499,000 is allocated for Water Quality Monitoring programs.

The Committee recommends a \$1,356,000 increase above the request for Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction. The Committee further recommends in this program that the \$1,356,000 increase is allocated to the High Production Volume Chemical Challenge Program and the High Production Volume Information System.

The Committee recommends a \$2,754,000 decrease below the request for TRI/Right to Know program.

In addition, the Committee recommends the following increases to the budget request:

- \$11,000,000 for the National Rural Water Association, including source water protection programs;
- \$3,000,000 for the Rural Community Assistance Program;
- \$650,000 for the Groundwater Protection Council;
- \$750,000 for the Water Systems Council Wellcare Program;
- \$2,000,000 for America's Clean Water Foundation;
- \$4,000,000 for the Small Public Water System Technology Centers at Western Kentucky University, the University of New Hampshire, the University of Alaska-Sitka, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Missouri-Columbia, Montana State University, the University of Illinois, and Mississippi State University;
- \$1,500,000 for the Southwest Missouri Water Quality Improvement Project;
- \$1,000,000 for an air quality improvement program in Lincoln County, Montana;
- \$500,000 for the University of Northern Iowa to develop new environmental technologies for small business outreach;
- \$2,000,000 for the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality to complete remediation work on Tar Creek;
- \$500,000 for the Alabama Department of Environmental Management for a water and wastewater training program;
- \$1,000,000 for EPA Region 10 environmental compliance;
- \$500,000 for the Ozarks Environmental and Water Resources Institute at Southwest Missouri State University;
- \$250,000 for the Spokane River Bi-State Non-Point Phosphorus study;
- \$1,800,000 for Long Island Sound restoration;
- \$300,000 for a restoration project in Greenwood Lake, New Jersey;
- \$500,000 for a brownfields remediation project in the City of Waterbury, Connecticut;
- \$500,000 for a water quality project in Storm Lake, Iowa;
- \$500,000 for Hawaii Island Economic Development Board's Big Island Recycle program;
- \$450,000 for the storm water research program at the University of Vermont;
- \$500,000 for the environmental and science education program in New Bedford, Massachusetts;
- \$200,000 for Grambling University in Louisiana for a water quality research program;
- \$500,000 for Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation lake restoration in Louisiana;
- \$775,000 for environmental clean-up and research programs in Lake Champlain, Vermont;
- \$250,000 for the Waste to Energy project in Stamford, Connecticut;
- \$250,000 for the Northwest Straits Commission, Washington State University beach watchers marine resources program;
- \$500,000 for a lead-based paint hazard control program in Omaha, Nebraska;

- \$500,000 for the University of West Florida Partnership for Environmental Research and Community Health [PERCH] program;
- \$250,000 for waterfront stormwater management analysis in East Providence, Rhode Island;
- \$250,000 for Walker Lake, Nevada Working Group’s lake restoration program;
- \$250,000 for Mohawk Valley, New York Water Authority’s bacteria detection program;
- \$250,000 for the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality site assessment program;
- \$130,000 for an environmental education initiative at Crow’s Neck Environmental Education Center in Tishomingo County, Mississippi; and
- \$300,000 for the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer study.

The Committee provides the budget request of \$2,000,000 for the Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center [Water ISAC], and directs that the Water ISAC shall be implemented through a grant to the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies.

Unclear regulations, conflicting court decisions and inadequate scientific information are creating confusion about whether emergency release reporting requirements in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act apply to emissions from poultry, dairy or livestock operations. Producers want to meet their environmental obligations, but need clarification from the EPA on the applicability of these laws to their operations. The Committee directs the Agency to resolve this issue expeditiously.

The Committee is aware of the work EPA is doing through the NAFTA Technical Working Group on Pesticides, and encourages the efforts to harmonize regulatory processes. Prices for agricultural pesticides continue to be a concern for farmers in the United States due to unnecessary barriers to trade in agricultural pesticides. The Committee urges EPA to work swiftly to complete harmonization actions through the Technical Working Group as soon as possible, and to seek input from stakeholders on development and implementation of a joint labeling process.

The Committee supports initiatives at EPA to develop a market-based sustainable electronics recycling infrastructure, and encourages the Agency to work with manufacturers on a product stewardship solution. The Committee is concerned about the growing patchwork of State laws that confuses and burdens manufacturers, retailers, recyclers and consumers.

The Committee directs the Environmental Protection Agency to continue administering the fiscal year 2005 and subsequent annual Lake Champlain appropriations through Region I and the New England Interstate Water Pollution Commission.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2005	\$37,696,000
Budget estimate, 2006	36,955,000
House allowance	37,955,000
Committee recommendation	36,955,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Inspector General [OIG] provides audit, evaluation, and investigation products and advisory services to improve the performance and integrity of EPA programs and operations. The IG also holds the position of Inspector General for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

Trust fund resources are transferred to this account directly from the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$36,955,000 for the Office of Inspector General, which is equal to the budget request and \$741,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level. In addition, \$13,536,000 will be available by transfer from the Superfund account, for a total of \$50,491,000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2005 (including emergency appropriations)	\$41,688,000
Budget estimate, 2006	40,218,000
House allowance	40,218,000
Committee recommendation	40,218,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The appropriation for buildings and facilities at EPA provides for the design and construction of EPA-owned facilities as well as for the repair, extension, alteration, and improvement of facilities utilized by the Agency. These funds correct unsafe conditions, protect health and safety of employees and Agency visitors, and prevent deterioration of structures and equipment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$40,218,000 for buildings and facilities, \$1,530,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level (excluding emergency appropriations) and equal to the budget request and the House allowance.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2005	\$1,247,477,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,279,333,000
House allowance	1,258,333,000
Committee recommendation	1,256,165,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

On October 17, 1986, Congress amended the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 [CERCLA] through the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 [SARA]. SARA reauthorized and expanded the Hazardous Substance Superfund to address the problems of uncontrolled hazardous waste sites and spills. Specifically, the legislation mandates that EPA: (1) provide emergency response to hazardous waste spills; (2) take emergency action at hazardous waste sites

that pose an imminent hazard to public health or environmentally sensitive ecosystems; (3) engage in long-term planning, remedial design, and construction to clean up hazardous waste sites where no financially viable responsible party can be found; (4) take enforcement actions to require responsible private and Federal parties to clean up hazardous waste sites; and (5) take enforcement actions to recover costs where the fund has been used for cleanup. Due to the site-specific nature of the Agency's Superfund program, site-specific travel is not considered part of the overall travel ceiling set for the Superfund account.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,256,165,000 for Superfund, \$8,688,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$23,168,000 below the budget request and \$2,168,000 below the House allowance.

Changes to the budget request are listed below.

The Committee recommends a \$1,479,000 decrease below the request for Acquisition Management.

The Committee recommends a \$140,000 decrease below the request for Alternative Dispute Resolution.

The Committee recommends a \$2,066,000 decrease below the request for Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance.

The Committee recommends a \$441,000 decrease below the request for Civil Enforcement.

The Committee recommends a \$11,000 decrease below the request for Compliance Assistance and Centers.

The Committee recommends a \$11,000 decrease below the request for Compliance Incentives.

The Committee recommends a \$499,000 decrease below the request for Compliance Monitoring.

The Committee recommends a \$6,000 decrease below the request for congressional, intergovernmental, and external relations.

The Committee recommends a \$5,646,000 decrease below the request for Facilities Infrastructure and Operations.

The Committee recommends a \$300,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Communication and Information. The Committee did not allocate funding for the Laboratory Preparedness and Response program.

The Committee recommends a \$200,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection. The Committee did not allocate funding for the Decontamination program.

The Committee recommends a \$11,965,000 decrease below the request for Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery.

The Committee recommends a \$414,000 decrease below the request for Human Resources Management.

The Committee recommends a \$3,000 decrease below the request for Information Security.

The Committee recommends a \$20,000 decrease below the request for Legal Advice: Environmental Program.

The Committee recommends a \$356,000 decrease below the request for Radiation: Protection.

The Committee recommends a \$105,000 decrease below the request for Research: Land Protection and Restoration.

The Committee recommends a \$494,000 increase above the request for Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal. The Committee recommends a total of \$849,761,000 for Superfund cleanup.

The Committee is concerned that EPA has not yet issued a Record of Decision [ROD] for Libby, Montana, despite years of cleanup efforts. The Committee directs the Agency to issue its Record of Decision for Libby, Montana no later than December 1, 2005. The Agency should also provide a report on the contents contained within the ROD to the Committee no later than January 15, 2006.

The Committee directs the Agency to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service and other trustee bureaus within the Department of the Interior to incorporate trustee concerns during Superfund remediation and to enhance the integration of Superfund remedial activities and natural resource damage assessment activities. A joint EPA and Interior report on these efforts should be provided to the Committee by September 29, 2006.

At this time, the Committee disagrees with the position of the House as to the need for an additional contaminated sediment sites study and does not recommend that EPA enter into any further agreement with the National Academy of Sciences.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

Appropriations, 2005	\$69,440,000
Budget estimate, 2006	73,027,000
House allowance	73,027,000
Committee recommendation	73,027,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorizations Act of 1986 [SARA] established the leaking underground storage tank [LUST] trust fund to conduct corrective actions for releases from leaking underground storage tanks containing petroleum and other hazardous substances. EPA implements the LUST program through State cooperative agreement grants which enable States to conduct corrective actions to protect human health and the environment, and through non-State entities including Indian tribes under section 8001 of RCRA. The trust fund is also used to enforce responsible parties to finance corrective actions and to recover expended funds used to clean up abandoned tanks.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the budget request of \$73,027,000 for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, which is \$3,587,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request and the House allowance. The Committee directs that not less than 85 percent of these funds be provided to the States and tribal governments.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

Appropriations, 2005	\$15,872,000
Budget estimate, 2006	15,863,000
House allowance	15,863,000
Committee recommendation	15,863,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1987 and amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds to prepare for and prevent releases of oil and other petroleum products into navigable waterways. EPA is also reimbursed for incident specific response costs through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which pursuant to law is managed by the United States Coast Guard. EPA is responsible for: directing all cleanup and removal activities posing a threat to public health and the environment; conducting site inspections, including compelling responsible parties to undertake cleanup actions; reviewing containment plans at facilities; reviewing area contingency plans; pursuing cost recovery of fund-financed cleanups; and conducting research of oil cleanup techniques. Funds for this appropriation are provided through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund which is composed of fees and collections made through provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the Comprehensive Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act, the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$15,863,000 for the oil spill response trust fund, which is \$9,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request and the House allowance.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2005	\$3,575,349,000
Budget estimate, 2006	2,960,800,000
House allowance	3,127,800,000
Committee recommendation	3,395,550,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The "State and tribal assistance grants" account funds grants to support the State revolving fund programs; State, tribal, regional, and local environmental programs; and special projects to address critical water and waste water treatment needs.

Included in this account are funds for the following infrastructure grant programs: Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds; United States-Mexico Border Program; Alaska Native villages; and Brownfield State and Tribal Response program grants authorized by CERCLA section 128(a).

It also contains the following categorical environmental grants, State/tribal program grants, and assistance and capacity building grants: (1) air resource assistance to State, regional, local, and trib-

al governments (secs. 105 and 103 of the Clean Air Act); (2) radon State and Tribal grants; (3) water pollution control agency resource supplementation (sec. 106 of the FWPCA); (4) BEACHS Protection grants (sec. 406 of FWPCA as amended); (5) nonpoint source (sec. 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act); (6) wetlands State program development; (7) water quality cooperative agreements (sec. 104(b)(3) of FWPCA); (8) targeted watershed grants; (9) wastewater operator training grants; (10) public water system supervision; (11) underground injection control; (12) drinking water program State homeland security coordination grants; (13) hazardous waste financial assistance; (14) Brownfields activities authorized by CERCLA section 104(k); (15) underground storage tanks; (16) pesticides program implementation; (17) lead grants; (18) toxic substances compliance; (19) pesticides enforcement; (20) the Environmental Information Exchange Network; (21) pollution prevention; (22) sector program; and (23) Indians general assistance grants.

As in past fiscal years, reprogrammings associated with Performance Partnership Grants need not be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,395,550,000 for State and Tribal Assistance Grants, a decrease of \$179,799,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, an increase of \$434,750,000 over the budget request, and \$267,750,000 over the House allowance.

Bill language specifically provides funding levels for the following programs in this account:

\$1,100,000,000 for the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund, which is \$370,000,000 above the request;

\$850,000,000 for the Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund, which is equal to the request;

\$50,000,000 for the United States-Mexico Border program, which is equal to the request, and includes \$7,000,000 for the El Paso Utilities Board and \$2,000,000 for the City of Brownsville water supply project;

\$40,000,000 for grants to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs in rural and native Alaskan communities, which is \$25,000,000 above the request;

\$1,000,000 for the Clean School Bus Initiative, which is \$9,000,000 below the request; and

\$90,000,000 for Brownfields infrastructure projects, which is \$30,500,000 below the request.

Within the State and Tribal Categorical Grant program, the changes to the budget request are listed below.

The Committee recommends a \$10,000,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Brownfields.

The Committee recommends a \$656,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Environmental Information.

The Committee recommends a \$934,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance.

The Committee recommends a \$1,772,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319).

The Committee recommends a \$16,900,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106). The Committee further recommends in this program that \$43,000,000 is allocated to water quality monitoring activities.

The Committee recommends a \$1,040,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention.

The Committee recommends a \$854,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision [PWSS].

The Committee recommends a \$1,206,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Radon.

The Committee recommends a \$18,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Sector Program.

The Committee recommends a \$23,000,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: State and Tribal Performance Fund.

The Committee recommends a \$1,856,000 increase above the request for Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds. The Committee further recommends that \$6,000,000 in this program is allocated for a regional pilot program for the Chesapeake Bay that shall demonstrate effective non-point source nutrient reduction approaches that target small watersheds and accelerate nutrient reduction in innovative, sustainable, and cost-effective ways. Partners in the effort to protect the Bay include: Maryland; Pennsylvania; Virginia; the District of Columbia; the Chesapeake Bay Commission, a tri-state legislative body; EPA, which represents the Federal Government; and participating citizen advisory groups.

The Committee recommends a \$306,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control [UIC].

The Committee recommends a \$1,200,000 increase above the request for Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training.

The Committee recommends a \$5,120,000 decrease below the request for Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development.

The Committee has not included funding for the infrastructure assistance grant for Puerto Rico.

The Committee includes \$200,000,000 for targeted project grants. These grants include a local match of 45 percent for all grants utilized unless a hardship waiver is provided by the EPA. The EPA is directed to expedite any request for a waiver and assist any communities that are likely to qualify for a waiver in processing such a request. The targeted project grants are as follows:

\$800,000 for the Coosa Valley Water Supply District surface water project in Alabama;

\$700,000 for the sewer improvement project in the City of York, Alabama;

\$750,000 for a water and sewer project in Unalaska, Alaska;

\$250,000 for a water and sewer project in the City of Craig, Alaska;

\$800,000 for the drinking water project in the Town of Walden, Colorado;

\$650,000 for the water treatment facility in the City of Alamosa, Colorado;

\$100,000 for a wastewater treatment facility improvements project in Brush, Colorado;

\$100,000 for wastewater facility upgrades in Yuma, Colorado;

\$500,000 for the West Area Combined Sewer Overflow Tunnel in the City of Atlanta, Georgia;

\$500,000 for a wastewater treatment project in the City of Twin Falls, Idaho;

\$400,000 for water system infrastructure improvements in the City of Castleford, Idaho;

\$600,000 for construction of a wastewater collection and treatment facility in Valley County, Idaho;

\$750,000 for construction of a wastewater treatment facility in the Town of Waverly and Morgan County, Indiana;

\$500,000 for construction of a wastewater treatment plant in Sioux City, Iowa;

\$500,000 for a new drinking water transmission line in the City of Medicine Lodge, Kansas;

\$500,000 for water infrastructure improvements in Johnson County, Kansas;

\$1,000,000 for the wastewater sewer line extension project in the City of South Campbellsville, Kentucky;

\$500,000 for the City of Columbia, Kentucky, and the Adair County Regional Water Treatment Plant;

\$472,000 for the waterline extension and water system upgrade project in the Town of Dover-Foxcroft, Maine;

\$500,000 for the wastewater treatment project in the Town of Machias, Maine;

\$500,000 for the construction of a new wastewater treatment plant in the City of Willmar, Minnesota;

\$750,000 for a wastewater treatment improvements project in Wheeler, Mississippi;

\$500,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in the City of Flowood, Mississippi;

\$500,000 for the regional wastewater program in DeSoto County, Mississippi;

\$2,000,000 for wastewater system rehabilitation for the West Rankin Water Authority in Mississippi;

\$747,383 for a drinking water and wastewater treatment improvements project in the Chipley area in the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi;

\$500,000 for a wastewater infrastructure evaluation and repair project in the City of Ridgeland, Mississippi;

\$1,200,000 for wastewater treatment facilities improvements in the City of Pontotoc, Mississippi;

\$1,000,000 for a water and sewer infrastructure project in the City of Biloxi, Mississippi;

\$250,000 for a water and sewer infrastructure project in the Town of McLain, Mississippi;

\$700,000 for a water and sewer infrastructure project in Forrest County, Mississippi;

\$1,000,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in the City of Brookhaven, Mississippi;

\$500,000 for the St. Louis, Missouri Combined Sewer Overflow Project;

\$500,000 for the expansion of the Clarence Cannon Wholesale Water Commission Treatment Plant in Missouri;

\$2,250,000 for water system infrastructure improvements in the City of Helena, Montana;

\$1,000,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in the Seeley Lake Sewer District, Montana;

\$750,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in the Town of St. Ignatius, Montana;

\$500,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in the Pablo/Lake County Water and Sewer District, Montana;

\$500,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in the Wisdom Sewer District, Montana;

\$500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the City of Lincoln, Nebraska;

\$500,000 for the Waterworks Project in the City of Berlin, New Hampshire;

\$500,000 for the combined sewer overflow separation project in the City of Manchester, New Hampshire;

\$1,000,000 for the Valley Utilities Project in the City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, New Mexico;

\$1,000,000 for wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system in the Town of Edgewood, New Mexico;

\$1,000,000 for completion of Phase I of a sewer system in Kirtland, New Mexico;

\$150,000 for the Greene Community in Greene County, Ohio for wastewater and drinking water projects;

\$850,000 for construction of a sewer collection and treatment system in the Village of Higginsport, Ohio;

\$200,000 for a drinking water line replacement in Muskingum County, Ohio;

\$800,000 for the wastewater collection and treatment system in the City of Elmira, Ohio, and the City of Burlington, Ohio;

\$250,000 for storm sewer pipe construction in Millcreek Township, Pennsylvania;

\$1,750,000 for the Allegheny County Sanitary Authority for the Three Rivers Wet Weather program in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania;

\$500,000 for water infrastructure improvements in the City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania;

\$250,000 for public sewer service extensions in Menallen Township, Pennsylvania;

\$250,000 for central sewer collection and treatment replacement in Tulpehocken Township, Pennsylvania;

\$800,000 for the combined sewer overflow and flood protection project in the City of Plum Creek and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania;

\$200,000 for an interceptor improvements project in Penn Hills, Pennsylvania;

\$250,000 for the stormwater infrastructure improvements project in the Borough of Pottstown, Pennsylvania;
\$750,000 for a sewer improvement project in the Borough of Archbald, Pennsylvania;
\$875,000 for a new water storage tank in the Town of Westerly, Rhode Island;
\$1,000,000 for the Lake Tansi Sewer Project in Cumberland County, Tennessee;
\$1,000,000 for the Watauga River Regional Water Authority in Carter County, Tennessee;
\$1,000,000 for the West End water and wastewater infrastructure project in Oak Ridge, Tennessee;
\$500,000 for the sewer overflow prevention project in the City of Austin, Texas;
\$1,500,000 for construction of a drinking water nitrate remediation plant for Centerfield, Utah, and Mayfield, Utah;
\$700,000 for an arsenic and perchlorate removal project in Magna, Utah;
\$300,000 for water infrastructure improvements for Judge Tunnel in Park City, Utah;
\$500,000 for a wastewater treatment plant in Eagle Mountain, Utah;
\$1,000,000 for drinking water and stormwater infrastructure improvements in Sandy City, Utah;
\$500,000 for a wastewater treatment infrastructure improvements project in the Town of Onancock, Virginia;
\$500,000 for Project Alpha in Lee County, Virginia;
\$1,000,000 for a wastewater treatment plant improvements project in the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming;
\$500,000 for regional wastewater treatment improvements for the City of Fayetteville, Arkansas;
\$500,000 for improvements to the Little Maumelle water treatment plant in the City of Little Rock, Arkansas;
\$375,000 for the Martin Slough interceptor project in the City of Eureka, California;
\$375,000 for a water facility project in the City of Santa Paula, California;
\$375,000 for a wastewater treatment plant expansion in Crescent City, California;
\$375,000 for a perchlorate treatment program in the City of Pasadena, California;
\$500,000 for wastewater treatment plant improvements in the Cities of Englewood and Littleton, Colorado;
\$500,000 for a stormwater improvement program in Jefferson County, Colorado;
\$500,000 for infrastructure upgrades at water pollution control plant in the Town of Plainville, Connecticut;
\$500,000 for a wastewater turbine technology project for the City of New Haven, Connecticut;
\$1,000,000 for a combined sewer overflow program in the City of Wilmington, Delaware;
\$800,000 for the Emerald Coast treatment plant replacement project for the Northwest Florida Water Management District;

\$300,000 for Lake Region water treatment plant improvements for the South Florida Water Management District;
 \$1,000,000 for statewide cesspool replacement in the County of Maui and other communities, Hawaii;
 \$800,000 for a combined sewer separation project in the City of Ottumwa, Iowa;
 \$800,000 for a sewer separation project in the City of Davenport, Iowa;
 \$250,000 for drinking water infrastructure improvements in the City of Springfield, Illinois;
 \$250,000 for construction of a wastewater treatment facility in the Village of Pecatonica, Illinois;
 \$750,000 for drinking water improvements in the City of Wauconda, Illinois;
 \$500,000 for the Sewer Improvement Consortium of Lake Bluff, Highwood, Highland Park and Lake Forest, Illinois;
 \$250,000 for water system upgrades in the Village of Port Byron, Illinois;
 \$1,700,000 for water infrastructure upgrades in the City of Upland, Indiana;
 \$400,000 for the Shreveport Municipal Water Distribution system backflow prevention project in Shreveport, Louisiana;
 \$1,000,000 for a combined sewer overflow abatement project in Bristol County, Massachusetts;
 \$1,000,000 for the Greenmount Interceptor sewer improvement project in the City of Baltimore, Maryland;
 \$500,000 for a combined sewer overflow project in the City of Westernport, Maryland;
 \$500,000 for a combined sewer overflow project in the City of Frostburg, Maryland;
 \$350,000 for a combined sewer overflow project in the City of Cumberland, Maryland;
 \$150,000 for a sewer line repair project in the City of Emmitsburg, Maryland;
 \$150,000 for wastewater lagoon repair in the City of Funkstown, Maryland;
 \$150,000 for a septage treatment program in Traverse City, Michigan;
 \$1,000,000 for a combined sewer overflow control program for the City of Port Huron, Michigan;
 \$500,000 for the Oakland County, Michigan Comprehensive Water Security Program;
 \$500,000 for the Rouge River CSO, SSO Wet Weather demonstration project in Wayne County, Michigan;
 \$250,000 for the North-East Relief Sewer [NERS] project in Genesee County, Michigan;
 \$250,000 for sewer plant improvements in the City of Saginaw, Michigan;
 \$250,000 for public sewer system improvements in the City of Northport, Michigan;
 \$225,000 for regional wastewater treatment system improvements in Eastern Calhoun County, Michigan;
 \$500,000 for the sanitary management district of Crow Wing County, Minnesota;

\$500,000 for the Western Lake Superior Sanitary District in the City of Duluth, Minnesota;

\$170,000 for a wastewater treatment plant improvement project in the City of Bozeman, Montana;

\$750,000 for drinking water system upgrades in the City of Belgrade, Montana;

\$725,000 for water treatment plant regulatory improvements in the City of Grafton, North Dakota;

\$500,000 for water infrastructure improvements in the City of Devils Lake, North Dakota;

\$500,000 for regional water treatment facility infrastructure in the City of Riverdale, North Dakota;

\$400,000 for regional water treatment facility improvements in the City of Washburn, North Dakota;

\$300,000 for regional drinking water infrastructure expansion for the Towns of Hankinson, Wyndemere, LaMoure, and Oakes, North Dakota (Southeast Area);

\$300,000 for wastewater treatment facility upgrades in the City of Lakota, North Dakota;

\$300,000 for water treatment facility improvements in the City of Parshall, North Dakota;

\$250,000 for water and sewer improvement projects in the City of Crosby, North Dakota;

\$250,000 for drinking water distribution improvements for the North Central Rural Water Consortium, North Dakota;

\$250,000 for rural water district infrastructure improvements in Walsh County, North Dakota;

\$500,000 for combined sewer separation projects in the City of Omaha, Nebraska;

\$500,000 for stormwater infrastructure improvements at Farnham Park in the City of Camden, New Jersey;

\$500,000 for the Sip Avenue CSO retention and flooding abatement project engineering and design in Jersey City, New Jersey;

\$1,000,000 for a water project in the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico;

\$1,000,000 for a wastewater project in the City of Belen, New Mexico;

\$150,000 for water infrastructure improvements for the North Lemmon Valley Artificial Recharge Project in North Lemmon Valley, Nevada;

\$100,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Henderson Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant in the City of Henderson, Nevada;

\$50,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Marlette/Hobart water system in Carson City, Nevada;

\$650,000 for the Searchlight sewer system upgrades/Clark County Reclamation District improvement project in Nevada;

\$400,000 for water infrastructure improvements in Douglas County, Nevada;

\$1,000,000 for a stormwater restoration project in the Town of North Hempstead, New York;

\$1,000,000 for a water and sewer extension project in the Town of Bethel, New York;

\$750,000 for sanitary district facility upgrades in the City of Winchester, Oregon;

\$500,000 for water infrastructure improvements in the City of Cumberland, Rhode Island;

\$200,000 for water infrastructure improvements in the City of North Smithfield, Rhode Island;

\$180,000 for water infrastructure improvements in the City of Springfield, South Dakota;

\$800,000 for a water and wastewater master plan development in Rapid City, South Dakota;

\$1,000,000 for a wastewater treatment project in the Town of Pownal, Vermont;

\$1,000,000 for water treatment projects in the Town of Waitsfield, Vermont;

\$500,000 for a groundwater remediation project in North Clark County, Washington;

\$500,000 for a sewer collection system in the City of Carnation, Washington;

\$800,000 for a radionuclide standard drinking water project in the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin; and

\$800,000 for a metropolitan sewage district interceptor system program in the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The Committee includes a total of \$140,000,000 for Brownfields activities within this account. These funds augment funding of \$25,000,000 included in the Environmental Programs and Management account for fiscal year 2006, a total of \$165,000,000 for EPA Brownfields program.

The Committee also recommends a rescission of \$58,000,000 in unobligated amounts associated with grants, contracts, and inter-agency agreements whose availability has expired.

The Committee has included bill language, as carried in previous appropriations acts, to clarify that drinking water health effects studies are to be funded through the science and technology account.

The Committee also includes bill language addressing technical corrections to targeted project grants.

The Committee has also included bill language, as requested by the administration and as carried in previous appropriations acts, to: (1) extend for 1 year the authority for States to transfer funds between the Clean Water SRF and the Drinking Water SRF; (2) waive the one-third of 1 percent cap on the Tribal set aside from non-point source grants; (3) increase to 1.5 percent the cap on the Tribal set-aside for the Clean Water SRF; (4) require that any funds provided to address the water infrastructure needs of colonias within the United States along the United States-Mexico border be spent only in areas where the local governmental entity has established an enforceable ordinance or rule which prevents additional development within colonias that lack water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure; and (5) change the limitation on the amounts of the SRF a State can use for administration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee has included bill language, as proposed in the budget request and as carried in previous appropriations acts, permitting EPA, in carrying out environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, to use cooperative agreements with federally-recognized tribes and inter-tribal consortia.

The Committee includes language authorizing EPA to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

The bill includes a provision to extend eligibility to Brownfields sites that were purchased prior to the enactment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act of 2001.

The Committee has included bill language providing certain personnel authority for the Office of Research and Development.

The Committee has included a provision that addresses the Federal cost share for the radon program.

Bill language requires EPA to complete and publish a technical study to look at safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers in use, associated with compliance with small engines regulations, required pursuant to Public Law 108-199. The Committee directs EPA to coordinate this study with the U.S. Fire Administration and/or the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. The study of small engines in use by consumers shall include real-world scenarios involving at minimum: operator burn, fire due to contact with flammable items, and refueling.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund	5,737	6,106	6,106	6,106	+ 369		
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES	729,379	815,903	758,654	770,563	+ 41,184	- 45,340	+ 11,909
TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	9,955,228	9,792,069	9,799,693	9,877,741	- 77,487	+ 85,672	+ 78,048
Appropriations	(9,543,364)	(9,509,904)	(9,495,648)	(9,565,744)	(+ 22,380)	(+ 55,840)	(+ 70,096)
Emergency appropriations	(103,454)				(- 103,454)		
Rescission	(- 30,000)	(- 30,000)	(- 30,000)	(- 30,000)			
TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY							
Science and Technology							
Air toxics and quality:							
Clean air allowance trading programs (also EPM)	8,734	9,353	9,353	8,734		- 619	- 619
Federal support for air quality mgmt (also EPM)	10,521	10,016	10,016	10,016	- 505		
Federal support for air toxics program (also EPM)	2,562	2,265	2,265	2,265	- 297		
Federal vehicle and fuels standards/certification	57,436	66,567	59,567	61,436	+ 4,000	- 5,131	+ 1,869
Radiation: Protection (also EPM; HSS)	3,069	2,121	2,121	2,121	- 948		
Radiation: Response preparedness (also EPM)	2,320	3,576	3,576	3,576	+ 1,256		
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality	84,642	93,898	86,898	88,148	+ 3,506	- 5,750	+ 1,250
Enforcement: Forensics support (also HSS)	13,048	13,737	13,737	13,737	+ 689		
Climate protection: Climate protection program (also EPM)	19,006	17,732	20,032	17,732	- 1,274		- 2,300
Homeland security:							
Critical infrastructure protection:							
Homeland infrastructure protection (except water sentinel) (also EPM; HSS)	3,495	3,569	3,569	3,495		- 74	- 74
Water sentinel and related training		44,000	9,000	5,585	+ 5,585	- 38,415	- 3,415

Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection	3,495	47,569	12,569	9,080	+ 5,585	- 38,489	- 3,489
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery							
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities) (also HSS)	13,671	14,806	14,806	14,806	+ 1,135	- 11,101	- 3,101
Decontamination (also EPM; HSS)	13,609	24,710	16,710	13,609		- 600	- 600
Laboratory preparedness & response (also EPM; HSS)		600	600			- 4,000	- 4,000
Safe buildings		4,000	4,000				
(Transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(2,071)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(- 71)		
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery	27,280	44,116	36,116	28,415	+ 1,135	- 15,701	- 7,701
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also EPM; B&F; HSS)	2,024	2,100	2,100	2,100	+ 76		
Subtotal, Homeland security	32,799	93,785	50,785	39,595	+ 6,796	- 54,190	- 11,190
IT/Data management/Security: IT/Data management (also EPM; LUST; OSR; HSS)	4,345	4,251	4,251	4,251	- 94		
Indoor air:							
Indoor air: Radon program (also EPM)	495	442	442	442	- 53		
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program (moved to reduce risks in fiscal year 2006)	843				- 843		
Reduce risks from indoor air (also EPM)		832	832	832	+ 832		
Subtotal, Indoor air	1,338	1,274	1,274	1,274	- 64		
Operations and administration:							
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also EPM; B&F; LUST; OSR; HSS)	8,466	8,716	8,716	8,466		- 250	- 250
Pesticide licensing:							
Pesticides: Registration of new pesticides (also EPM)	2,466	2,490	2,490	2,490	+ 24		
Pesticides: Review/Reregistration of existing pesticides (also EPM)	2,478	2,506	2,506	2,506	+ 28		
Subtotal, Pesticide licensing	4,944	4,996	4,996	4,996	+ 52		
Research/Congressional priorities	65,665		40,000	50,000	- 15,665	+ 50,000	+ 10,000
Research: Clean air:							
Research: Air toxics	16,956	16,387	16,387	16,387	- 569	- 956	- 956
Research: Global change	19,578	20,534	20,534	19,578		- 6,048	- 6,048
Research: National ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)		71,451	71,451	65,403	+ 65,403		
Research: Particulate matter (Moved to NAAQS in fiscal year 2006)	60,863				- 60,863		
Research: Troposphere ozone	4,041				- 4,041		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
		Budget estimate	House allowance			2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Subtotal, Research: Clean air	101,438	108,372	108,372	108,372	101,368	-70	-7,004	-7,004
Research: Clean water								
Research: Drinking water	48,665	45,690	45,690	45,690	45,690	-2,975
Research: Water quality	44,993	55,900	55,900	55,900	46,592	+1,599	-9,308	-9,308
Subtotal, Research: Clean water	93,658	101,590	101,590	101,590	92,282	-1,376	-9,308	-9,308
Research: Human health and ecosystems:								
Human health risk assessment	32,723	36,240	36,240	36,240	36,240	+3,517
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(3,559)	(4,022)	(4,022)	(4,022)	(4,022)	(+463)
Research: Computational toxicology	11,994	13,832	12,632	12,632	11,994	-1,838	-638
Research: Endocrine disruptor	10,392	8,705	10,605	10,605	10,392	+1,687	-213
Research: Fellowships	12,042	8,327	12,027	12,027	12,042	+3,715	+15
Research: Human health and ecosystems	167,356	169,632	177,632	177,632	167,356	-2,276	-10,276
Subtotal, Research: Human health and ecosystems	234,507	236,736	249,136	249,136	238,024	+3,517	+1,288	-11,112
Research: Land protection:								
Research: Land protection & restoration (also HSS)	9,065	13,696	13,696	13,696	9,065	-4,631	-4,631
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(22,994)	(23,099)	(23,099)	(23,099)	(23,099)	(+105)
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(6,596)	(1,485)	(1,485)	(1,485)	(1,485)	(-5,111)
Subtotal, Research: Land protection	9,065	13,696	13,696	13,696	9,065	-4,631	-4,631
Research: Sustainability:								
Research: Economics and decision science (EDS)	2,645	2,645	2,645	2,645	+2,645
Research: Environmental technology verification (ETV)	3,181	3,203	3,203	3,203	3,203	+22
Research: Pollution prevention (also HSS)	37,232	-37,232
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(588)	(-588)
Research: Sustainability (other activities)	23,188	23,188	23,188	23,188	+23,188

Subtotal, Research: Sustainability	40,413	29,036	29,036	29,036	29,036	-11,377	
Toxic research and prevention:									
Research: Pesticides and toxics	27,792	29,753	29,753	29,753	29,753	+1,961	
Water: Human health protection:									
Drinking water programs (also EPM)	2,935	3,068	3,068	3,068	3,068	+133	
Total, Science and Technology	744,061	760,640	765,340	730,795	730,795	-29,845	-34,545	
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(35,808)	(30,606)	(30,606)	(30,606)	(30,606)	(-5,202)	
Environmental Programs and Management									
Air toxics and quality:									
Clean air allowance trading programs (also S&T)	16,873	18,234	18,234	18,234	18,234	+1,361	
Federal stationary source regulations	21,768	23,509	23,509	23,509	23,509	+1,741	
Federal support for air quality management:									
Federal support for air quality management (other activities) (also S&T)	88,192	95,891	95,891	88,192	88,192	-7,699	-7,699	
Clean diesel initiative	15,000	10,000	-15,000	-10,000	
Subtotal, Federal support for air quality management	88,192	110,891	105,891	88,192	88,192	-22,699	-17,699	
Federal support for air toxics program (also S&T)	24,590	25,431	25,431	24,590	24,590	-841	-841	
Radiation: Protection (also S&T, HSS)	11,122	11,765	11,765	11,122	11,122	-643	-643	
Radiation: Response preparedness (also S&T)	2,624	2,636	2,636	2,624	2,624	-12	-12	
Stratospheric ozone: Domestic programs	5,013	3,969	5,169	5,013	5,013	+1,044	-156	
Stratospheric ozone: Multilateral fund	9,920	13,500	10,500	8,000	8,000	-1,920	-2,500	
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality	180,102	209,935	203,135	181,284	181,284	+1,182	-21,851	
Brownfields	24,301	29,638	24,638	25,000	25,000	+699	+362	
Climate protection program:									
Climate protection program (other activities) (also S&T)	43,910	41,030	41,030	41,030	41,030	-2,880	
Energy star	46,700	50,500	50,000	50,500	50,500	+3,800	+500	
Methane to markets	300	4,000	500	3,000	3,000	+2,700	+2,500	
Subtotal, Climate protection	90,910	95,530	91,530	94,530	94,530	+3,620	+3,000	
Compliance:									
Compliance assistance and centers (also LUST, OSR, HSS)	26,613	29,097	29,097	29,097	29,097	+2,484	
Compliance incentives (also HSS)	8,963	9,622	9,622	9,622	9,622	+659	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Compliance monitoring (also HSS) (Some of these funds were in IT/Data management in fiscal year 2005)	66,328	93,412	90,512	87,328	+21,000	-6,084	-3,184
Subtotal, Compliance	101,904	132,131	129,231	126,047	+24,143	-6,084	-3,184
Enforcement:							
Civil enforcement (also OSR, HSS)	112,463	117,462	114,462	117,462	+4,999		+3,000
Criminal enforcement (also HSS)	39,101	37,326	36,326	39,101		+1,775	+2,775
Enforcement training (also HSS)	3,428	2,499	2,499	3,428		+929	+929
Environmental justice (also HSS)	5,883	3,980	5,883	3,980	-1,903		-1,903
NEPA implementation	12,039	12,440	12,440	12,440	+401		
Subtotal, Enforcement	172,914	173,707	171,610	176,411	+3,497	+2,704	+4,801
Environmental protection/Congressional priorities	92,326		40,000	50,000	-42,326	+50,000	+10,000
Geographic programs:							
Geographic program: Chesapeake Bay	22,756	20,746	20,746	23,000	+244	+2,254	+2,254
Geographic program: Great Lakes	21,287	21,519	21,519	22,000	+713	+481	+481
Geographic program: Gulf of Mexico	3,895	4,468	4,468	5,000	+1,105	+532	+532
Geographic program: Lake Champlain	2,480	955	2,000	1,955	-525	+1,000	-45
Geographic program: Long Island Sound	2,332	477	2,000	477	-1,855		-1,523
Geographic program: Puget Sound			2,000				-2,000
Geographic program: Other:							
Community action for a renewed environment (CARE)	1,984	9,000	3,000	1,984		-7,016	-1,016
Other (other activities)	4,923	4,686	4,686	5,833	+930	+1,167	+1,167
Subtotal, Geographic program: Other	6,907	13,686	7,686	7,837	+930	-5,849	+151
Regional geographic initiatives	7,687	8,862	7,762	7,000	-687	-1,862	-762

Subtotal, Geographic programs	67,344	70,713	68,181	67,269	-75	-3,444	-912
Homeland security:							
Homeland security: Communication and information (also HSS):							
Communication and information (other activities)	5,133	5,450	5,450	5,450	+317	-1,230	-1,230
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T)		1,230	1,230				
Subtotal, Homeland security: Communication and information	5,133	6,680	6,680	5,450	+317	-1,230	-1,230
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection:							
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination) (also S&T; HSS) ..	6,896	6,847	6,847	6,847	-49		
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS)		100	100			-100	-100
Subtotal, Homeland security: critical infrastructure protection	6,896	6,947	6,947	6,847	-49	-100	-100
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery (also S&T; HSS): Decon-							
tamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	1,822	3,348	3,348	2,748	+926	-600	-600
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T;							
B&F; HSS)	6,294	6,403	6,403	6,403	+109		
Subtotal, Homeland security	20,145	23,378	23,378	21,448	+1,303	-1,930	-1,930
Indoor air:							
Indoor air: Asthma program	10,468				-10,468		
Indoor air: Environment tobacco smoke program	2,400				-2,400		
Indoor air: Radon program (also S&T)	5,142	5,918	5,918	5,000	-142	-918	-918
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program	9,326				-9,326		
Reduce risks from indoor air (also S&T)		23,496	23,496	22,194	+22,194	-1,302	-1,302
Subtotal, Indoor air	27,336	29,414	29,414	27,194	-142	-2,220	-2,220
Information exchange/Outreach:							
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination	5,970	6,890	6,890	6,890	+920		
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations (also HSS)	48,624	49,753	49,753	49,753	+1,129		
Environmental education	8,957	9,000	9,000	7,000	-1,957	+7,000	-2,000
Exchange network (also HSS)	16,361	22,739	18,739	18,000	+1,639	-4,739	-739
Small business ombudsman	3,712	3,911	3,911	3,911	+199		
Small minority business assistance	2,264	2,348	2,348	2,348	+84		
State and local prevention and preparedness	11,855	12,328	12,328	11,855			
Toxics release inventory (TRI)/Right to know	14,310	14,754	14,754	12,000	-2,310	-473	-473
Tribal—Capacity building	10,640	11,049	11,049	11,049	+409	-2,754	-2,754

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Subtotal, Information exchange/Outreach	122,693	123,772	128,772	122,806	+ 113	- 966	- 5,966
International programs:							
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination	244				- 244		
Commission for environmental cooperation	3,773	4,210	4,210	4,210	+ 437		
Environment and trade	1,500	1,787	1,787	1,787	+ 287		
International capacity building	5,751	6,450	6,450	5,000	- 751	- 1,450	- 1,450
Persistent organic pollutants (POPs) implementation	1,627	2,806	2,806	1,627		- 1,179	- 1,179
U.S./Mexico border	5,612	5,975	5,975	5,975	+ 363		
Subtotal, International programs	18,507	21,228	21,228	18,599	+ 92	- 2,629	- 2,629
IT/Data management/Security:							
Information security (also HSS)	4,131	3,888	3,888	3,888	- 243		
IT/Data management (also S&T; LUST; OSR; HSS) (\$22.59 million moved to EPM Compliance in fiscal year 2006)	106,123	105,999	95,999	93,000	- 13,123	- 12,999	- 2,999
Subtotal, IT/Data management/Security	110,254	109,887	99,887	96,888	- 13,366	- 12,999	- 2,999
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review:							
Administrative law	4,890	5,109	5,109	5,109	+ 219		
Alternative dispute resolution (also HSS)	931	1,051	1,051	1,051	+ 120		
Civil rights/title VI compliance	12,119	12,530	12,530	12,530	+ 411		
Legal advice: Environmental program (also HSS)	34,644	36,314	36,314	36,314	+ 1,670		
Legal advice: Support program	12,555	13,088	13,088	13,088	+ 533		
Regional science and technology	3,245	3,643	3,643	3,643	+ 398		
Regulatory innovation	20,014	25,021	23,118	20,014		- 5,007	- 3,104
Regulatory/Economic-management and analysis	14,821	16,713	16,713	14,821		- 1,892	- 1,892
Science advisory board	4,361	4,881	4,881	4,881	+ 520		
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review	107,580	118,350	116,447	111,451	+ 3,871	- 6,899	- 4,996

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
		Budget estimate	House allowance			2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Water: Human health protection:								
Beach/fish programs	3,210	3,264	3,264	3,264	3,264	+54		
Drinking water programs (also S&T)	93,258	101,090	98,090	98,090	95,000	+1,742	-6,090	-3,090
National Rural Water Association			10,000	10,000				-10,000
Subtotal, Water: Human health protection	96,468	104,354	111,354	111,354	98,264	+1,796	-6,090	-13,090
Water quality protection: Marine pollution	11,358	12,279	12,279	12,279	12,279	+921		
Surface water protection:								
Surface water protection (other activities)	179,503	185,501	185,501	185,501	185,501	+5,998		
Water quality monitoring	6,700	9,300	9,300	9,300	4,499	-2,201	-4,801	-4,801
Subtotal, Surface water protection	186,203	194,801	194,801	194,801	190,000	+3,797	-4,801	-4,801
Subtotal, Water quality protection	197,561	207,080	207,080	207,080	202,279	+4,718	-4,801	-4,801
Subtotal, Environmental Programs and Management	2,294,902	2,403,764	2,389,491	2,389,491	2,333,416	+38,514	-70,348	-56,075
Offsetting receipts from toxics and pesticides fees		-50,000					+50,000	
Total, Environmental Programs and Management	2,294,902	2,353,764	2,389,491	2,389,491	2,333,416	+38,514	-20,348	-56,075
Office of Inspector General								
Audits, evaluations, and investigations	37,696	36,955	37,955	37,955	36,955	-741		-1,000
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(12,896)	(13,536)	(13,536)	(13,536)	(13,536)	(+640)		
Buildings and Facilities								
Homeland security:								
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	11,408	11,500	11,500	11,500	11,500	+92		

Operations and administration: Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; HSS; LUST; OSR)	27,280	28,718	28,718	28,718	28,718	+1,438	
Subtotal, Buildings and Facilities	38,688	40,218	40,218	40,218	40,218	+1,530	
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324)	3,000	-3,000	
Total, Buildings and Facilities	41,688	40,218	40,218	40,218	40,218	-1,470	
Hazardous Substance Superfund								
Air toxics and quality: Radiation: Protection (also S&T; EPM)	2,031	2,387	2,387	2,031	2,031	-356	
Audits, evaluations, and investigations	12,896	13,536	13,536	13,536	13,536	+640	
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General)	(-12,896)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-640)	
Enforcement:								
Civil enforcement (also EPM; OSR)	122	883	883	442	442	+320	-441	
Criminal enforcement (also EPM)	7,895	9,504	8,504	9,504	9,504	+1,609	+1,000	
Enforcement training (also EPM)	822	614	614	614	614	-208	
Environmental justice (also EPM)	938	845	845	845	845	-93	
Forensics support (also S&T)	4,112	3,840	3,840	3,840	3,840	-272	
Superfund: Enforcement	153,266	164,258	157,258	164,258	164,258	+10,992	+7,000	
Superfund: Federal facilities enforcement	10,667	10,241	10,241	10,241	10,241	-426	
Subtotal, Enforcement	177,822	190,185	182,185	189,744	189,744	+11,922	-441	
Compliance:								
Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; LUST; OSR)	23	23	12	12	+12	-11	
Compliance incentives (also EPM)	145	168	168	157	157	+12	-11	
Compliance monitoring (also EPM)	159	1,157	1,157	658	658	+499	-499	
Subtotal, Compliance	304	1,348	1,348	827	827	+523	-521	
Homeland security:								
Homeland security: Communication and information (also EPM):								
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	300	300	-300	
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection:								
Critical infrastructure protection (other activities) (also S&T; EPM)	1,923	852	852	852	852	-1,071	
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	200	200	-200	
Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection	1,923	1,052	1,052	852	852	-1,071	-200	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery:							
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	8,283	12,550	10,550	10,550	+ 2,267	- 2,000
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	9,500	- 9,500
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities) (also S&T)	25,996	26,915	26,915	26,450	+ 454	- 465	- 465
(Transfer to Science and Technology)	(- 2,071)	(- 2,000)	(- 2,000)	(- 2,000)	(+ 71)
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery	34,279	48,965	37,465	37,000	+ 2,721	- 11,965	- 465
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; EPM; B&F)	672	600	600	600	- 72
Subtotal, Homeland security	36,874	50,917	39,417	38,452	+ 1,578	- 12,465	- 965
Information exchange/Outreach:							
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations (also EPM)	155	161	161	155	- 6	- 6
Exchange network (also EPM)	2,235	1,676	1,676	1,676
Subtotal, Information exchange/Outreach	2,390	1,837	1,837	1,831	- 559	- 6	- 6
IT/Data management/Security:							
Information security (also EPM)	406	409	409	406	- 3	- 3
IT/Data management (also S&T; EPM; LUST; OSR)	17,945	16,113	16,113	16,113	- 1,832
Subtotal, IT/Data management/Security	18,351	16,522	16,522	16,519	- 1,832	- 3	- 3
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review:							
Alternative dispute resolution (also EPM)	845	985	985	845	- 140	- 140
Legal advice: Environmental program (also EPM)	816	836	836	816	- 20	- 20
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review	1,661	1,821	1,821	1,661	- 160	- 160

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	House allowance		Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
		Budget estimate	House allowance		2005 appropriation	Budget estimate
IT/Data management/Security: IT/Data management (also S&T; EPM; HSS; OSR)	176	178	178	178	+2
Operations and administration: Acquisition management (also EPM; HSS)	341	346	346	346	+5
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also EPM; HSS)	866	936	936	936	+70
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; HSS; OSR)	872	884	884	884	+12
Human resources management (also EPM; HSS)	3	3	3	3
Subtotal, Operations and administration	2,082	2,169	2,169	2,169	+87
Research: Land protection: Research: Land protection and restoration (also S&T; HSS; OSR)	624	646	646	646	+22
Underground storage tanks (LUST/UST): Underground storage tanks (LUST/UST) (also EPM)	9,279	10,584	10,584	10,584	+1,305
LUST Cooperative agreements	56,424	58,676	58,676	58,676	+2,252
Subtotal, Underground storage tanks (LUST/UST)	65,703	69,260	69,260	69,260	+3,557
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	69,440	73,027	73,027	73,027	+3,587
Oil Spill Response						
Enforcement: Civil enforcement (also EPM; HSS)	1,742	1,789	1,789	1,789	+47
Compliance: Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; HSS; LUST)	274	287	287	287	+13
IT/Data management/Security: IT/Data management (also S&T; EPM; HSS; LUST)	33	33	33	33
Oil Oil spill: Prevention, preparedness and response	12,465	12,344	12,344	12,344	-121
Operations and administration: Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; HSS; LUST)	463	504	504	504	+41
Research: Land protection Research: Land protection and restoration (also S&T; HSS; LUST)	895	906	906	906	+11

	15,872	15,863	15,863	15,863	15,863	— 9
Total, Oil Spill Response						— 9
Pesticide registration fund	19,245	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	- 4,245
Pesticide registration fees	-19,245	- 15,000	- 15,000	- 15,000	- 15,000	+ 4,245
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)							
Air toxics and quality: Clean school bus initiative	7,440	10,000	10,000	10,000	1,000	- 6,440	- 9,000
Brownfields: Brownfields projects	89,280	120,500	97,500	90,000	90,000	+ 720	- 7,500
Infrastructure assistance:							
Infrastructure assistance: Alaska Native villages	44,640	15,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	- 4,640	+ 25,000
Infrastructure assistance: Clean water state revolving fund (SRF)	1,091,200	730,000	750,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	+ 8,800	+ 350,000
Use of balances from expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements			100,000				- 100,000
Subtotal, Clean water state revolving fund	1,091,200	730,000	850,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	+ 8,800	+ 250,000
Infrastructure assistance: Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF)	843,200	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	+ 6,800
Infrastructure assistance: Mexico border	49,600	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	+ 400
Infrastructure assistance: Puerto Rico	3,849	4,000	4,000			- 3,849	- 4,000
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance	2,032,489	1,649,000	1,769,000	2,040,000	2,040,000	+ 7,511	+ 271,000
STAG infrastructure grants/Congressional priorities	309,548		200,000	200,000	200,000	- 109,548
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (excluding categorical grants)	2,438,757	1,779,500	2,076,500	2,331,000	2,331,000	- 107,757	+ 254,500
Categorical grants:							
Categorical grant: Beaches protection	9,920	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	+ 80
Categorical grant: Brownfields	49,600	60,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	+ 400
Categorical grant: Environmental information	19,344	20,000	20,000	19,344	19,344	- 656	- 656
Categorical grant: Hazardous waste financial assistance	103,466	104,400	104,400	103,466	103,466	- 934	- 934
Categorical grant: Homeland security	4,960	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	+ 40
Categorical grant: Lead	13,392	13,700	13,700	13,700	13,700	+ 308
Categorical grant: Nonpoint source (Sec. 319)	207,328	209,100	209,100	207,328	207,328	- 444	- 1,772
Categorical grant: Pesticides enforcement	19,344	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900	
Categorical grant: Pesticides program implementation	12,896	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100	+ 204
Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106) (other activities)	168,620	177,900	169,900	172,000	172,000	+ 3,380	+ 2,100
Water quality monitoring	39,700	54,000	54,000	43,000	43,000	+ 3,300	- 11,000
Subtotal, Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106)	208,320	231,900	223,900	215,000	215,000	+ 6,680	- 8,900

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation		Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	Budget estimate	House allowance	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate		House allowance		
Categorical grant: Pollution prevention	4,960	6,000	6,000	5,000	4,960	-1,040	-40			
Categorical grant: Public water system supervision (PWSS)	99,746	100,600	100,600	100,600	99,746	-854	-854			
Categorical grant: Radon	6,944	8,150	8,150	6,944	6,944	-1,206	-1,206			
Categorical grant: Sector program	2,232	2,250	2,250	2,250	2,232	-18	-18			
Categorical grant: State and local air quality management	223,200	223,550	223,550	223,550	223,550					
Categorical grant: State and tribal performance fund		23,000	23,000			-23,000				
Categorical grant: Targeted watersheds	17,856	15,000	15,000	15,000	16,856	+1,856	+1,856			
Categorical grant: Toxics substances compliance	5,007	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150					
Categorical grant: Tribal air quality management	10,743	11,050	11,050	11,050	11,050					
Categorical grant: Tribal general assistance program	61,504	57,500	57,500	57,500	57,500					
Categorical grant: Underground injection control (UIC)	10,694	11,000	11,000	11,000	10,694	-306	-306			
Categorical grant: Underground storage tanks	11,904	11,950	11,950	11,950	11,950					
Categorical grant: Wastewater operator training	1,488				1,200	+288	+1,200			
Categorical grant: Water quality cooperative agreements	16,864			15,000		-16,864	-15,000			
Categorical grant: Wetlands program development	14,880	20,000	20,000	17,000	14,880	-5,120	-2,120			
Subtotal, Categorical grants	1,136,592	1,181,300	1,181,300	1,151,300	1,122,550	-58,750	-28,750			
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	3,575,349	2,960,800	2,960,800	3,227,800	3,453,550	+492,750	+225,750			
Rescission of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements (various EPA accounts)				-100,000	-58,000	-58,000	+42,000			
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	3,575,349	2,960,800	2,960,800	3,127,800	3,395,550	+434,750	+267,750			
TOTAL TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,026,485	7,520,600	7,520,600	7,708,027	7,881,989	+144,496	+173,962			
Appropriations	(8,023,485)	(7,520,600)	(7,520,600)	(7,808,027)	(7,939,989)	(-83,496)	(+131,962)			
Emergency appropriations	(3,000)					(-3,000)				
Rescissions				(-100,000)	(-58,000)	(-58,000)				
(Transfer out)	(-48,704)	(-44,142)	(-44,142)	(-44,142)	(-44,142)	(+4,562)	(+42,000)			

(By transfer)	(48,704)	(44,142)	(44,142)	(44,142)	(- 4,562)
TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
FOREST SERVICE						
Forest and Rangeland Research						
Forest inventory and analysis	55,926	68,714	62,100	58,434	+ 2,508	- 10,280
Research and development programs	220,458	216,686	222,900	222,458	+ 2,000	+ 5,772
Total, Forest and rangeland research	276,384	285,400	285,000	280,892	+ 4,508	- 4,108
State and Private Forestry						
Forest Health Management:						
Federal lands forest health management	54,236	50,023	55,000	50,023	- 4,213	- 4,977
Cooperative lands forest health management	47,629	22,308	48,000	22,608	- 25,021	+ 300
Subtotal, Forest Health Management	101,865	72,331	103,000	72,631	- 29,234	+ 300
Cooperative Fire Protection:						
State fire assistance	32,920	20,919	35,422	26,500	- 6,420	+ 5,581
Volunteer fire assistance	5,917	5,917	6,000	6,000	+ 83	+ 83
Subtotal, Cooperative Fire Protection	38,837	26,836	41,422	32,500	- 6,337	+ 5,664
Cooperative Forestry:						
Forest stewardship	32,320	37,099	37,399	32,320	- 4,779
Forest Legacy	57,134	80,000	25,000	62,632	+ 5,498	- 17,368
Urban and Community Forestry	31,950	27,475	28,175	28,675	- 3,275	+ 500
Economic action programs	19,032	7,979	14,200	- 4,832	+ 14,200
Forest resource information and analysis	4,958	4,657	5,000	4,657	- 301	+ 6,221
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry	145,394	149,231	103,553	142,484	- 2,910	- 6,747
International program	6,410	4,989	6,900	7,000	+ 590	+ 100
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324)	49,100	- 49,100
Total, State and Private Forestry	341,606	253,387	254,875	254,615	- 86,991	+ 1,228
						- 260

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	House allowance		Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)			
		Budget estimate	House allowance		2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	
Departmental Offices	729,379	815,903	758,654	770,563	+41,184	-45,340	+11,909	
Total, Title I—Department of the Interior	9,955,228	9,792,069	9,799,693	9,877,741	-77,487	+85,672	+78,048	
Environmental Protection Agency	8,026,485	7,520,600	7,708,027	7,881,989	-144,496	+361,389	+173,962	
TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY								
TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES								
Forest Service	4,770,598	4,065,000	4,241,358	4,122,767	-647,831	+57,767	-118,591	
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	2,985,066	3,047,966	3,103,072	3,067,966	+82,900	+20,000	-35,106	
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	79,842	80,289	80,289	80,289	+447	
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	76,041	76,024	76,024	76,024	-17	
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	3,258	2,717	2,717	2,717	-541	
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	4,930	8,601	8,601	8,601	+3,671	
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	5,916	6,300	6,300	6,300	+384	
Smithsonian Institution	615,158	615,035	615,281	624,135	+8,977	+9,100	+8,854	
National Gallery of Art	102,654	113,300	113,300	111,600	+8,946	-1,700	-1,700	
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	33,021	33,000	27,800	33,000	-21	+5,200	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	8,863	9,201	9,085	9,201	+338	+116	
National Endowment for the Arts	121,264	121,264	131,264	126,264	+5,000	+5,000	-5,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities	138,054	138,054	143,054	143,054	+5,000	+5,000	
Commission of Fine Arts	1,768	1,893	1,893	1,893	+125	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	6,902	7,000	7,000	7,492	+590	+492	+492	
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	4,536	4,988	4,860	4,943	+407	-45	+83	
National Capital Planning Commission	7,888	8,344	8,177	8,244	+356	-100	+67	
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum	40,858	43,233	41,880	43,233	+2,375	+1,353	
Presidio Trust	19,722	20,000	20,000	19,722	-278	-278	

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2006, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

—————
JULY 26, 2005.—Ordered to be printed
—————

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2361]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2361) “making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes”, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)),

(d) *This section and the amendments made by this section take effect as of December 8, 2004.*

SEC. 133. *Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

“(43)(A) The Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Watertrail, a series of routes extending approximately 3,000 miles along the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay in the States of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware and the District of Columbia that traces Captain John Smith’s voyages charting the land and waterways of the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay.

“(B) The study shall be conducted in consultation with Federal, State, regional, and local agencies and representatives of the private sector, including the entities responsible for administering—

“(i) the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network authorized under the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; title V of Public Law 105–312); and

“(ii) the Chesapeake Bay Program authorized under section 117 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267).

“(C) The study shall include an extensive analysis of the potential impacts the designation of the trail as a national historic watertrail is likely to have on land and water, including docks and piers, along the proposed route or bordering the study route that is privately owned at the time the study is conducted.”.

Sec. 134. (a) *Notwithstanding section 508(c) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 104–333) there is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses for the Memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr. authorized in that Act.*

(b) The funds appropriated in subsection (a) shall only be made available after the entire amount is matched by non-federal contributions (not including in-kind contributions) that are pledged and received after July 26, 2005, but prior to the date specified in subsection (c).

(c) Section 508(b)(2) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 is amended by striking “November 12, 2006” and inserting “November 12, 2008”.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, reha-

bilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$741,722,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project; and not to exceed \$19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,381,752,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, including administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$37,455,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$40,218,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project; \$1,260,621,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund upon the date of enactment of this Act as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to \$1,260,621,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$13,536,000 shall be transferred to the “Office of Inspector General”

appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2007, and \$30,606,000 shall be transferred to the "Science and Technology" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2007.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$73,027,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$15,863,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$3,261,696,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$900,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the "Act"); of which up to \$50,000,000 shall be available for loans, including interest free loans as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)(A), to municipal, inter-municipal, interstate, or State agencies or nonprofit entities for projects that provide treatment for or that minimize sewage or stormwater discharges using one or more approaches which include, but are not limited to, decentralized or distributed stormwater controls, decentralized wastewater treatment, low-impact development practices, conservation easements, stream buffers, or wetlands restoration; \$850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, hereafter none of the funds made available under this heading in this or previous appropriations Acts shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; \$50,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; \$35,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and waste infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages: Provided, That, of these funds: (1) the State of Alaska shall provide a match of 25 percent; (2) no more than 5 percent of the funds may be used for administrative and overhead expenses; and (3) not later than October 1, 2005 the State of Alaska shall make awards consistent with the State-wide priority list established in 2004 for all water,

sewer, waste disposal, and similar projects carried out by the State of Alaska that are funded under section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1301) or the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) which shall allocate not less than 25 percent of the funds provided for projects in regional hub communities; \$200,000,000 shall be for making special project grants for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying this Act, and, for purposes of these grants, each grantee shall contribute not less than 45 percent of the cost of the project unless the grantee is approved for a waiver by the Agency; \$90,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs; \$7,000,000 for making cost-shared grants for school bus retrofit and replacement projects that reduce diesel emissions; and \$1,129,696,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104-134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which \$50,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended, \$20,000,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs, and \$16,856,000 shall be for making competitive targeted watershed grants: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, State authority under section 302(a) of Public Law 104-182 shall remain in effect: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2006 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2006, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under title VI of that Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of that Act: Provided further, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made avail-

able to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: Provided further, That, notwithstanding this or any other appropriations Act, heretofore and hereafter, after consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and for the purpose of making technical corrections, the Administrator is authorized to award grants under this heading to entities and for purposes other than those listed in the joint explanatory statements of the managers accompanying the Agency's appropriations Acts for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure and for water quality protection.

In addition, \$80,000,000 is hereby rescinded from prior year funds in appropriation accounts available to the Environmental Protection Agency: Provided, That such rescissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and inter-agency agreements whose availability, under the original project period for such grant or interagency agreement or contract period for such contract, has expired: Provided further, That such rescissions shall include funds that were appropriated under this heading for special project grants in fiscal year 2000 or earlier that have not been obligated on an approved grant by September 1, 2006.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003), as amended.

Notwithstanding CERCLA 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV), appropriated funds for fiscal year 2006 may be used to award grants or loans under section 104(k) of CERCLA to eligible entities that satisfy all of the elements set forth in CERCLA section 101(40) to qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser except that the date of acquisition of the property was prior to the date of enactment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act of 2001.

For fiscal years 2006 through 2011, the Administrator may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, make not to exceed five appointments in any fiscal year under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209 for the Office of Research and Development.

Beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, and notwithstanding section 306 of the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Federal share of the cost of radon program activities implemented with Federal assistance under section 306 shall not exceed 60 percent in the third and subsequent grant years.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 201. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to accept, consider or rely on third-party intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides, or to conduct intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides until the Administrator issues a final rulemaking on this subject. The Administrator shall allow for a period of not less than 90 days for public comment on the Agency's proposed rule before issuing a final rule. Such rule shall not permit the use of pregnant women, infants or children as subjects; shall be consistent with the principles proposed in the 2004 report of the National Academy of Sciences on intentional human dosing and the principles of the Nuremberg Code with respect to human experimentation; and shall establish an independent Human Subjects Review Board. The final rule shall be issued no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of, or to delay the implementation of, Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 7629; relating to Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations).

SEC. 203. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, issue, implement, or enforce the proposed policy of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled "National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Requirements for Municipal Wastewater Treatment During Wet Weather Conditions", dated November 3, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 63042).

SEC. 204. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of 15 U.S.C. 2682(c)(3) or to delay the implementation of that section.

SEC. 205. None of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to publish proposed or final regulations pursuant to the requirements of section 428(b) of division G of Public Law 108-199 until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, has completed and published a technical study to look at safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers in use, associated with compliance with the regulations. Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall complete and publish the technical study.

the Department of the Interior’s Office of Law Enforcement and Security. The Department has assured the managers that staffing will be limited to 34 full time equivalent employees and eight detailed staff, except in the event of an emergency.

The conference agreement does not include a provision in section 125 of the Senate bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to collect and retain parking fees at the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial. The managers understand that the Department has determined that the Secretary currently has such authority pursuant to the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA).

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The conference agreement provides \$741,722,000 for science and technology instead of \$765,340,000 as proposed by the House and \$730,795,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the House recommended level are described below.

Air Toxics and Quality.—In air toxics and quality, there is a decrease of \$619,000 for the clean air allowance trading programs.

Climate Protection.—In climate protection programs, there is a decrease of \$1,000,000.

Research/Congressional Priorities.—The conference agreement provides a total of \$33,275,000 for high priority projects, a decrease of \$6,725,000 below the House recommended level. The managers have not agreed to a competitive solicitation this year for these programs. This issue may be revisited in future years. The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

State	Project name	Amount
1. AL	University of South Alabama Center for Estuarine Research	\$500,000
2. CA	Central California Ozone Study, San Joaquin Valleywide Air Pollution Study Agency.	375,000
3. CA	Irrigation Training and Research Center—Cal Poly., San Luis Obispo Flow Rate Measurement.	1,200,000
4. DE	Center for the Study of Metals in the Environment at the University of Delaware.	250,000
5. FL	FL Dept. of Citrus Abscission Chemical Studies	1,000,000
6. ID	Boise State University to continue research on multi-purpose sensors to detect and analyze contaminants and time-lapse imaging of shallow subsurface fluid flow.	500,000
7. IL	Clean Air Counts program emission reduction partnership with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.	800,000
8. KY	University of Louisville Lung Biology/Translational Lung Disease Program.	1,500,000
9. LA	Louisiana Smart Growth program in the State of Louisiana	500,000
10. NC	UNC Charlotte VisualGRID	500,000
11. ND	Center for Air Toxic Metals, EERC at the University of North Dakota	2,000,000
12. NM	National Environmental Respiratory Center [NERC] at the Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute in Albuquerque, New Mexico.	500,000
13. NY	Alfred University Center for Environmental and Energy Research	750,000
14. NY	Environmental Systems Center of Excellence at Syracuse Univ., NY Indoor Environment Quality.	2,000,000
15. OH	Ohio University Consortium for Energy, Economics, and the Environment.	500,000
16. OH	The Ohio State University Olentangy River Wetlands Park Teaching, Research, and Outreach Initiative.	500,000
17. SD	Missouri River Institute at the University of South Dakota	400,000
18. TN	University of Memphis Groundwater Institute to conduct a groundwater study.	500,000

State	Project name	Amount
19. TN	University of Tennessee at Knoxville Natural Resources Policy Center ...	500,000
20. TX	Comprehensive assessment of Lake Whitney at Baylor University	200,000
21. TX	Environmental program at the Water Policy Institute at Texas Tech University.	450,000
22. TX	Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxic Research Center	1,500,000
23. TX	Poultry science project at Stephen F. Austin State University	200,000
24. TX	Texas Air Quality Study 2	2,000,000
25. TX	Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research	400,000
26. TX	Texas State University System Geography and Geology Project	800,000
27. VT	Aiken Greening at the University of Vermont	400,000
28. VT	Proctor Maple Research Station in Underhill, Vermont	200,000
29. WI	Paper industry byproduct waste reduction research in Wisconsin	250,000
30. WV	National Alternative Fuels Training Consortium at West Virginia University.	2,000,000
31.	American Water Works Association Research Foundation	1,000,000
32.	Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research	750,000
33.	Mine Waste Technology program at the National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center.	2,100,000
34.	New England Green Chemistry Consortium	750,000
35.	Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy	1,500,000
36.	Water Environment Research Foundation	3,000,000
37.	Water Systems Council Wellcare Program	1,000,000
Total		33,275,000

Research: Clean Air.—In research: clean air, there are decreases of \$600,000 for global change and \$2,000,000 for national ambient air quality standards.

Research: Clean Water.—In research: clean water, there is a decrease of \$4,800,000 for water quality programs.

Research: Human Health and Ecosystems.—In research: human health and ecosystems, there is an increase of \$15,000 for fellowships and decreases of \$213,000 for endocrine disruptor research and \$5,376,000 for other research, which includes decreases of \$2,000,000 for exploratory grants, \$600,000 for aggregate risks, \$500,000 for condition assessments of estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico, and \$2,276,000 for a general program reduction, which should be applied after consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Research: Land Protection.—In research: land protection, there is a decrease of \$2,300,000 for land protection and restoration.

Other.—The managers do not agree with the transfer of research funds to other offices. In addition to the offices mentioned in House Report 109–80, this direction applies to the Office of the Administrator, which was inadvertently omitted from the House report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement provides \$2,381,752,000 for environmental programs and management instead of \$2,389,491,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,333,416,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the House recommended level are described below.

Air Toxics and Quality.—In Federal support for air quality management, there are decreases of \$5,000,000 for the clean diesel initiative and \$5,000,000 for other program activities. Other decreases include \$400,000 for radiation protection programs,

\$156,000 for stratospheric ozone domestic programs, and \$1,600,000 for stratospheric ozone multilateral programs.

Brownfields.—There is an increase of \$362,000 for brownfields support.

Climate Protection Programs.—In climate protection, there are increases of \$500,000 for the energy star program and \$1,500,000 for the methane to markets program.

Compliance Monitoring.—There is a decrease of \$3,184,000 for compliance monitoring.

Enforcement Programs.—In enforcement, there are increases of \$1,500,000 for civil enforcement, \$1,900,000 for criminal enforcement, and \$500,000 for enforcement training.

Environmental Protection/Congressional Priorities.—The conference agreement provides a total of \$50,543,000 for high priority projects, an increase of \$10,543,000 above the House recommended level. The managers have not agreed to a competitive solicitation this year for these programs. This issue may be revisited in future years. The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

State	Project Name	Amount
1. AL	Alabama Department of Environmental Management for a water and wastewater training program.	\$500,000
2. CA	Highland Learning Center	1,750,000
3. CT	Waste to Energy project in Stamford, Connecticut	250,000
4. CT	Wastewater turbine technology project for the City of New Haven, Connecticut.	500,000
5. FL	University of West Florida Partnership for Environmental Research and Community Health [PERCH] program.	500,000
6. HI	Hawaii Island Economic Development Board's Big Island Recycle program.	500,000
7. IA	University of Northern Iowa to develop new environmental technologies for small business outreach.	500,000
8. IA	Water quality project in Storm Lake, Iowa	500,000
9. IL	For an aquifer model of groundwater resources	938,000
10. LA	Grambling University in Louisiana for a water quality research program.	200,000
11. LA	Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation lake restoration in Louisiana	500,000
12. MA	Environmental and science education program in New Bedford, Massachusetts.	500,000
13. MD	Anacostia River Tidal Wetlands Project	1,000,000
14. MO	Ozarks Environmental and Water Resources Institute at Southwest Missouri State University.	500,000
15. MO	Southwest Missouri Water Quality Improvement Project	1,500,000
16. MS	Environmental education initiative at Crow's Neck Environmental Education Center in Tishomingo County, Mississippi.	130,000
17. MT	Air quality improvement program in Lincoln County, Montana	1,000,000
18. NC	EPA National Computer Center Research Triangle Park, NC Continuity of Operations/Disaster Recovery.	2,000,000
19. NE	Lead-based paint hazard control program in Omaha, Nebraska	500,000
20. NJ	Restoration project in Greenwood Lake, New Jersey	300,000
21. NV	Walker Lake, Nevada Working Group's lake restoration program	250,000
22. NY	Central NY Watersheds in Onondaga and Cayuga Counties Water Quality Management.	1,500,000
23. NY	Long Island Sound restoration	1,800,000
24. NY	Mohawk Valley, New York Water Authority's bacteria detection program	250,000
25. OK	Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality to complete remediation work on Tar Creek.	2,000,000
26. OR	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality site assessment program	250,000
27. RI	Waterfront stormwater management analysis in East Providence, Rhode Island.	250,000
28. VT	Environmental clean-up and research programs in Lake Champlain, Vermont.	775,000
29. VT	Storm water research program at the University of Vermont	450,000

State	Project Name	Amount
30. WA	Northwest Straits Commission, Washington State University beach watchers marine resources program.	250,000
31. WA	Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer study	300,000
32. WA	Spokane River Bi-State Non-Point Phosphorus study	250,000
33. WV	Canaan Valley Institute—On-going Operations	2,000,000
34.	America's Clean Water Foundation On-Farm Assessment and Environmental Review Program.	3,000,000
35.	EPA Region 10 environmental compliance	1,000,000
36.	Groundwater Protection Council	650,000
37.	National Assoc. of Development Organizations Training and Information Dissemination Related to Rural Brownfields, Air Quality Standards, and Water Infrastructure.	500,000
38.	National Biosolids Partnership	1,000,000
39.	National Rural Water Association, including source water protection programs.	11,000,000
40.	Ohio River Pollutant Reduction Program	1,500,000
41.	Rural Community Assistance Program	3,500,000
42.	Small Public Water System Technology Centers at Western Kentucky University, the University of New Hampshire, the University of Alaska-Sitka, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Missouri-Columbia, Montana State University, the University of Illinois, and Mississippi State University.	4,000,000
Total		50,543,000

Geographic Programs.—In geographic programs, there are increases of \$2,000,000 for the Chesapeake Bay program, \$532,000 for the Gulf of Mexico program, and \$1,167,000 in other activities for Lake Pontchartrain, and decreases of \$45,000 for the Lake Champlain program and \$1,523,000 for the Long Island Sound program.

Indoor Air Programs.—In indoor air, there is a decrease of \$400,000 for radon programs.

Information Exchange/Outreach.—In information exchange/outreach, there is a decrease of \$400,000 for State and local prevention and preparedness programs.

International Programs.—In international programs, there are decreases of \$250,000 for international capacity building and \$1,000,000 for the persistent organic pollutants program.

Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic Review.—There is a decrease of \$600,000 for the regulatory innovation program.

Pesticide Licensing.—In pesticide licensing, there is an increase of \$3,041,000 for review/re-registration of existing pesticides.

Toxics Risk Review and Prevention.—In the toxics risk review and prevention program, there is an increase of \$1,356,000 for the high production volume challenge and high production volume information system and a decrease of \$1,582,000 for the pollution prevention program.

Water: Ecosystems.—There is an increase of \$2,000,000 for Great Lakes Legacy Act programs.

Water: Human Health Protection.—There are decreases of \$1,500,000 for drinking water programs and \$10,000,000 for the National Rural Water Association, which is funded under the environmental protection/Congressional priorities activity detailed above.

Water Quality Protection.—There is a decrease of \$2,000,000 for the water quality monitoring program.

Bill Language.—Language is included increasing the earmark for official reception and representation expenses to \$19,000 for fiscal year 2006 only.

The managers agree to the following:

1. A total of \$5,000,000 is provided for the clean diesel initiative as described in House Report 109–80.

2. Within stratospheric ozone domestic programs, the Sunwise program should be continued at the fiscal year 2005 funding level.

3. A total of \$2,000,000 is provided for the Puget Sound geographic program under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. This program is to be administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.

4. Within indoor air programs, \$2,000,000 should be used to continue environmental tobacco-related programs. The managers note that, after this set-aside, there is still an increase for asthma programs above the fiscal year 2005 level.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement provides \$37,455,000 for the Office of Inspector General instead of \$37,955,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,955,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

The conference agreement provides \$40,218,000 for buildings and facilities as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The conference agreement provides \$1,260,621,000 for hazardous substance superfund instead of \$1,258,333,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,256,165,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the House recommended level are detailed below.

Air Toxics and Quality.—In air toxics and quality, there is a decrease of \$175,000 for radiation protection programs.

Enforcement.—In enforcement, there are increases of \$200,000 for civil enforcement and \$3,000,000 for Superfund enforcement.

Compliance.—In compliance, there are decreases of \$11,000 for compliance assistance and centers, \$11,000 for compliance incentives, and \$200,000 for compliance monitoring.

Information Exchange and Outreach.—There is a decrease of \$6,000 for congressional, intergovernmental, and external relations activities.

Information Technology/Data Management/Security.—There is a decrease of \$3,000 for information security.

Operations and Administration.—In operations and administration, there is a decrease of \$1,000,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations.

Superfund Cleanup.—In Superfund cleanup, there is an increase of \$494,000 for emergency response and removal.

Bill Language.—Language is included earmarking \$1,260,621,000 as the maximum payment from general revenues

for Superfund instead of \$1,258,333,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,256,165,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers are concerned that EPA has not yet issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for Libby, Montana, despite years of cleanup efforts. The managers direct the Agency to issue its Record of Decision for Libby, Montana no later than May 1, 2006. EPA should also provide a report on the contents of the ROD to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than June 15, 2006. The managers are disappointed that the Agency could not meet an earlier deadline, originally proposed by the Senate, and expect periodic updates on the progress of completion of the ROD for Libby, Montana.

The House proposed a study by the National Academy of Sciences of Superfund mega sites that involve dredging. Upon further reflection, the managers believe that the appropriate role for the NAS is to act as an independent peer review body that will conduct an objective evaluation of some of the ongoing dredging projects underway at Superfund mega sites. By undertaking such an evaluation, the Academy can serve as an objective voice on this issue. The manager expect that the evaluation will be initiated by December 1, 2005, and finished as soon as possible, but no later than one year after the Academy begins work. In addition, the managers insist that any such evaluation by the Academy should not delay in any way the progress of the Hudson River PCB dredging project or any other Superfund dredging project.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

The conference agreement provides \$73,027,000 for the leaking underground storage tank program as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

The conference agreement provides \$15,863,000 for oil spill response as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

The conference agreement provides \$3,261,696,000 for State and Tribal assistance grants and a rescission of \$80,000,000 from expired grants, contracts, and interagency agreements, instead of \$3,227,800,000 and a rescission of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,453,550,000 and a rescission of \$58,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The rescission is to be taken from expired grants, contracts, and interagency agreements in the various EPA accounts and is not exclusive to this account. Changes to the House recommended level are detailed below.

Air Toxics and Quality.—In air toxics and quality programs, there is a decrease of \$3,000,000 for the clean school bus initiative.

Brownfields.—There is a decrease of \$7,500,000 for brownfields projects.

Infrastructure Assistance.—There is an increase of \$20,000,000 for infrastructure assistance for Alaska Native villages, a net decrease of \$, ,000 for the clean water State revolving fund

and a decrease of \$4,000,000 for infrastructure assistance for Puerto Rico. The House proposal to direct rescinded funds to the CWSRF is not included in the conference agreement.

Infrastructure Grants/Congressional Priorities.—The conference agreement includes \$200,000,000 for special project grants as proposed by both the House and the Senate. The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

State	Project name	Amount
1. AK	Water and sewer project in the City of Craig, Alaska	\$250,000
2. AK	Water and sewer project in Unalaska, Alaska	750,000
3. AL	Coosa Valley Water Supply District surface water project in Alabama	800,000
4. AL	Haleyville, AL North Industrial Area Water Storage Tank	50,000
5. AL	Heflin, AL Industrial Site Water and Sewer Project	150,000
6. AL	Huntsville, AL City of Huntsville Water System Improvements	1,000,000
7. AL	Sewer improvement project in the City of York, Alabama	700,000
8. AL	Twin, AL Twin Water Authority Water Systems Renovation	250,000
9. AL	Water main extension improvements project in Alexander City, Alabama.	500,000
10. AR	Improvements to the Little Maumelle water treatment plant in the City of Little Rock, Arkansas.	500,000
11. AR	Regional wastewater treatment improvements for the City of Fayetteville, Arkansas.	500,000
12. AR	St. Charles, AR St. Charles Drainage Planning and Improvements	50,000
13. AZ	Avondale, AZ Avondale Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion	1,500,000
14. AZ	Safford, AZ City of Safford Waste Treatment Plant Debt Repayment to Arizona Infrastructure Finance Authority.	800,000
15. AZ	Tucson, AZ Tucson Water Security Demonstration Project	450,000
16. AZ	Wastewater treatment plant in Lake Havasu City, Arizona	1,500,000
17. CA	Arcadia, Sierra Madre, CA Joint Water Infrastructure	2,500,000
18. CA	Bakersfield, CA Rexland Acres Wastewater Treatment Project	1,500,000
19. CA	Bellflower, CA Drinking Water Infrastructure Improvement	378,000
20. CA	Cathedral City, CA Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	500,000
21. CA	Colfax, CA Colfax Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement	600,000
22. CA	Georgetown, CA Greenwood Lake Water Treatment Facility	1,500,000
23. CA	Lake Arrowhead, CA Lake Arrowhead Groundwater Development	250,000
24. CA	Martin Slough interceptor project in the City of Eureka, California	375,000
25. CA	Monterey, CA Monterey County Development and Implementation of Water Management Plan.	750,000
26. CA	Perchlorate treatment program in the City of Pasadena, California	375,000
27. CA	Riverside, CA Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	500,000
28. CA	San Bernardino, CA Lakes and Streams Project	1,000,000
29. CA	Santa Jose, CA Perchlorate Assistance Santa Clara Valley Water District.	2,000,000
30. CA	Solana Beach, CA Solana Beach Wastewater System Improvements	1,000,000
31. CA	Southern California Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Mission Springs Water District 1.6M, Brinton Reservoir (Banning) 1M, Bighorn-Desert View Water Agency 500K, SAWPA SARI 450K, Yucca Valley 350K, Dunlap 100K).	4,000,000
32. CA	Wastewater treatment plant expansion in Crescent City, California	375,000
33. CA	Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements project for the San Francisco Public Utility Commission in California.	500,000
34. CA	Water facility project in the City of Santa Paula, California	375,000
35. CO	Drinking water project in the Town of Walden, Colorado	800,000
36. CO	Stormwater improvement program in Jefferson County, Colorado	500,000
37. CO	Wastewater facility upgrades in Yuma, Colorado	100,000
38. CO	Wastewater treatment facility improvements project in Brush, Colorado	100,000
39. CO	Wastewater treatment plant improvements in the Cities of Englewood and Littleton, Colorado.	500,000
40. CO	Water treatment facility in the City of Alamosa, Colorado	650,000
41. CT	East Hampton, CT Municipal Water System Improvements	1,200,000
42. CT	Infrastructure upgrades at water pollution control plant in the Town of Plainville, Connecticut.	500,000
43. CT	Stamford, CT Mill River Stormwater Management Infrastructure Improvements.	1,000,000

State	Project name	Amount
44. DE	Combined sewer overflow program in the City of Wilmington, Delaware	1,000,000
45. FL	Citrus County, FL Homosassa Wastewater Collection System Project	750,000
46. FL	Coral Springs, FL Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	700,000
47. FL	East Central, FL East-Central Florida Integrated Water Resources	1,500,000
48. FL	Emerald Coast treatment plant replacement project for the Northwest Florida Water Management District.	800,000
49. FL	Jacksonville Beach, FL North 2nd Street Drainage Collection and Treatment System.	1,000,000
50. FL	Keaton Beach, FL Taylor Coastal Wastewater Project	750,000
51. FL	Lake Region water treatment plant improvements for the South Florida Water Management District.	300,000
52. FL	North Port, FL Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	500,000
53. FL	Pinellas Park, FL On-site Sewerage system elimination	1,787,000
54. GA	Columbus, GA—Ox Bow Meadows Wastewater Improvements	1,000,000
55. GA	Moultrie, GA City of Moultrie Wastewater Treatment Plant Rehabilitation.	350,000
56. GA	West Area Combined Sewer Overflow Tunnel in the City of Atlanta, Georgia.	500,000
57. HI	Statewide cesspool replacement in the following counties, \$500,000 for the County of Hawaii; \$400,000 for the County of Kauai; and, \$100,000 for the City and County of Hawaii.	1,000,000
58. IA	Combined sewer separation project in the City of Ottumwa, Iowa	800,000
59. IA	Construction of a wastewater treatment plant in Sioux City, Iowa	500,000
60. IA	Mason City, IA Sanitary Sewer Interceptor Project	1,000,000
61. IA	Sewer separation project in the City of Davenport, Iowa	800,000
62. ID	Construction of a wastewater collection and treatment facility in Valley County, Idaho.	600,000
63. ID	Wastewater treatment project in the City of Twin Falls, Idaho	500,000
64. ID	Water system infrastructure improvements in the City of Castleford, Idaho.	400,000
65. IL	Big Rock, IL Big Rock South Side Drainage System	175,000
66. IL	Calumet City, IL Water and Sewer Improvements	275,000
67. IL	Construction of a wastewater treatment facility in the Village of Pecatonica, Illinois.	250,000
68. IL	Drinking water improvements in the City of Wauconda, Illinois	750,000
69. IL	Drinking water infrastructure improvements in the City of Springfield, Illinois.	250,000
70. IL	Hampshire, IL Water and Wastewater System Improvements	600,000
71. IL	Hinckley, IL Water Main Replacement	418,000
72. IL	Pleasant Plains, IL New Sanitary Sewer Collection System and Wastewater Treatment Facilities.	765,000
73. IL	Sewer Improvement Consortium of Lake Bluff, Highwood, Highland Park and Lake Forest, Illinois.	500,000
74. IL	Water system upgrades in the Village of Port Byron, Illinois	250,000
75. IN	Construction of a wastewater treatment facility in Morgan County, Indiana for the Town of Waverly.	750,000
76. IN	Sandborn, IN Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	500,000
77. IN	Valparaiso, IN Valparaiso Sewer Infrastructure Improvements	825,000
78. IN	Water infrastructure upgrades in the City of Upland, Indiana	1,700,000
79. KS	New drinking water transmission line in the City of Medicine Lodge, Kansas.	500,000
80. KS	Water infrastructure improvements in Johnson County, Kansas	500,000
81. KS	Rose Hill, KS City of Rose Hill Sewer System Improvements	2,500,000
82. KY	City of Columbia, Kentucky, and the Adair County Regional Water Treatment Plant.	500,000
83. KY	Louisville, KY Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy Watershed Restoration.	1,000,000
84. KY	Somerset, KY Somerset Wastewater Treatment Plant	3,200,000
85. KY	Wastewater sewer line extension project in the City of South Campbellsville, Kentucky.	1,000,000
86. KY	Wastewater treatment plant expansion project in Culver City, Kentucky	500,000
87. LA	Shreveport Municipal Water Distribution system backflow prevention project in Shreveport, Louisiana.	400,000
88. LA	South Lake Charles, LA Wastewater Treatment Plant	1,000,000
89. LA	Tioga, LA Water Works District No. 3 of Rapides Parish—Drinking Water Extension.	1,500,000

State	Project name	Amount
90. MA	Combined sewer overflow abatement project in Bristol County, Massachusetts.	1,000,000
91. MA	Hartford, CT; Springfield, Chicopee, Holyoke, Ludlow, South Hadley, MA Connecticut River Clean-up.	2,000,000
92. MD	Anacostia Sanitary Sewer Overflow	500,000
93. MD	Combined sewer overflow project in the City of Cumberland, Maryland	350,000
94. MD	Combined sewer overflow project in the City of Frostburg, Maryland	500,000
95. MD	Combined sewer overflow project in the City of Westernport, Maryland	500,000
96. MD	Greenmount Interceptor sewer improvement project in the City of Baltimore, Maryland.	1,000,000
97. MD	Port Tobacco, MD Port Tobacco Watershed Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	200,000
98. MD	Sewer line repair project in the City of Emmitsburg, Maryland	150,000
99. MD	Wastewater lagoon repair in the City of Funkstown, Maryland	150,000
100. ME	Wastewater treatment project in the Town of Machias, Maine	500,000
101. ME	Waterline extension and water system upgrade project in the Town of Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.	472,000
102. MI	Combined sewer overflow control program for the City of Port Huron, Michigan.	1,000,000
103. MI	Detroit, MI Far Eastside Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvement Project.	1,500,000
104. MI	North-East Relief Sewer [NERS] project in Genesee County, Michigan	250,000
105. MI	Oakland County, MI Evergreen-Farmington Sanitary Sewer Overflow Control Demonstration Project.	2,000,000
106. MI	Public sewer system improvements in the City of Northport, Michigan	250,000
107. MI	Regional wastewater treatment system improvements in Eastern Calhoun County, Michigan.	225,000
108. MI	Rouge River CSO, SSO Wet Weather demonstration project in Wayne County, Michigan.	500,000
109. MI	Sewage treatment program in Traverse City, Michigan	150,000
110. MI	Sewer plant improvements in the City of Saginaw, Michigan	250,000
111. MN	Construction of a new wastewater treatment plant in the City of Willmar, Minnesota.	500,000
112. MN	Minneapolis, MN Combined Sewer Overflow Program	1,500,000
113. MN	Sanitary management district of Crow Wing County, Minnesota	500,000
114. MN	Western Lake Superior Sanitary District in the City of Duluth, Minnesota.	500,000
115. MO	Expansion of the Clarence Cannon Wholesale Water Commission treatment Plant in Missouri.	500,000
116. MO	Springfield, MO Wastewater System Improvements	1,200,000
117. MO	St. Louis, Missouri Combined Sewer Overflow Project	1,000,000
118. MO	Wastewater improvements project in the City of Seneca, Missouri	850,000
119. MS	Drinking water and wastewater treatment improvements project in the Chipley area in the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi.	747,000
120. MS	Regional wastewater program in DeSoto County, Mississippi	500,000
121. MS	Wastewater infrastructure evaluation and repair project in the City of Ridgeland, Mississippi.	500,000
122. MS	Wastewater system rehabilitation for the West Rankin Water Authority in Mississippi.	2,000,000
123. MS	Wastewater treatment facilities improvements in the City of Pontotoc, Mississippi.	1,200,000
124. MS	Wastewater treatment improvements in the City of Brookhaven, Mississippi.	1,000,000
125. MS	Wastewater treatment improvements in the City of Flowood, Mississippi.	500,000
126. MS	Wastewater treatment improvements project in Wheeler, Mississippi	750,000
127. MS	Water and sewer infrastructure project in Forrest County, Mississippi	700,000
128. MS	Water and sewer infrastructure project in the City of Biloxi, Mississippi	1,000,000
129. MS	Water and sewer infrastructure project in the Town of McLain, Mississippi.	250,000
130. MT	Drinking water system upgrades in the City of Belgrade, Montana	750,000
131. MT	Havre, MT Rocky Boy's/North Central Montana Regional Water System	1,000,000
132. MT	Wastewater treatment improvements in the Pablo/Lake County Water and Sewer District, Montana.	500,000
133. MT	Wastewater treatment improvements in the Seeley Lake Sewer District, Montana.	1,000,000

State	Project name	Amount
134. MT	Wastewater treatment improvements in the Town of St. Ignatius, Montana.	750,000
135. MT	Wastewater treatment improvements in the Wisdom Sewer District, Montana.	500,000
136. MT	Wastewater treatment plant improvement project in the City of Bozeman, Montana.	170,000
137. MT	Water system infrastructure improvements in the City of Helena, Montana.	2,250,000
138. NC	Anson County, NC Raw Water Intake Project	1,000,000
139. NC	Brightwater, NC Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (water distribution system) (grantee is City of Hendersonville).	587,000
140. NC	Cedar Grove, NC Cedar Grove Waterline Project	253,000
141. NC	Charlotte, NC Providence Road Water Line project	1,000,000
142. NC	Haywood County, NC Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Town of Clyde 500k, Canton 500k).	1,000,000
143. NC	Kannapolis, NC Groundwater Storage Tank & Fire Pump System	500,000
144. NC	Mitchell County, NC Ledger Community Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	500,000
145. NC	Moore County, NC North West Moore Water District Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	500,000
146. NC	Sylva, NC Jackson County Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	500,000
147. NC	Wake County, NC Jordan Lake Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	1,500,000
148. NC	Wilson, NC Wilson Wastewater Infrastructure Program	1,000,000
149. NC/VA	Sparta, NC & Independence, VA Virginia Carolina Water Authority Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	1,000,000
150. ND	Drinking water distribution improvements for the North Central Rural Water Consortium, North Dakota.	250,000
151. ND	Regional drinking water infrastructure expansion for the Towns of Hankinson, Wyndemere, LaMoure, and Oakes, North Dakota (Southeast Area).	300,000
152. ND	Regional water treatment facility improvements in the City of Washburn, North Dakota.	700,000
153. ND	Regional water treatment facility infrastructure in the City of Riverdale, North Dakota.	500,000
154. ND	Rural water district infrastructure improvements in Walsh County, North Dakota.	250,000
155. ND	Wastewater treatment facility upgrades in the City of Lakota, North Dakota.	300,000
156. ND	Water and sewer improvement projects in the City of Crosby, North Dakota.	250,000
157. ND	Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Devils Lake, North Dakota.	500,000
158. ND	Water treatment plant regulatory improvements in the City of Grafton, North Dakota.	725,000
159. NE	Combined sewer separation projects in the City of Omaha, Nebraska ..	500,000
160. NE	Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the City of Lincoln, Nebraska.	500,000
161. NH	Combined sewer overflow separation project in the City of Manchester, New Hampshire.	500,000
162. NH	Exeter, NH Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	1,000,000
163. NH	Waterworks Project in the City of Berlin, New Hampshire	500,000
164. NJ	\$250,000 for the Rahway City Sanitary Sewer I&I, and \$250,000 for the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority.	500,000
165. NJ	Bergen County, NJ Bergen County Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	1,000,000
166. NJ	Passaic Valley, NJ Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission Combined Sewage Overflow Project.	2,500,000
167. NJ	Stormwater infrastructure improvements at Farnham Park in the City of Camden, New Jersey.	500,000
168. NM	Construction of a wastewater treatment system in Kirtland, New Mexico.	1,000,000
169. NM	Village of Tijeras, NM Phase III Water System	952,000
170. NM	Wastewater and drinking water improvements project for the Albuquerque/Bernalillo Water Utility Authority in New Mexico.	1,000,000

State	Project name	Amount
171. NM	Wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system in the Town of Edgewood, New Mexico.	1,000,000
172. NM	Wastewater project in the City of Belen, New Mexico	1,000,000
173. NM	Water project in the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico	1,000,000
174. NV	Henderson, NV Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant	1,000,000
175. NV	Searchlight sewer system upgrades/Clark County Reclamation District improvement project in Nevada.	650,000
176. NV	Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Marlette/Hobart water system in Carson City, Nevada.	50,000
177. NV	Water infrastructure improvements for the North Lemmon Valley Artificial Recharge Project in North Lemmon Valley, Nevada.	150,000
178. NV	Water infrastructure improvements in Douglas County, Nevada	400,000
179. NY	Ballston Spa, NY Saratoga County Water Treatment and Transmission Facilities.	3,000,000
180. NY	Cayuga County, NY Village of Fairhaven Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	750,000
181. NY	Corning, NY Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	750,000
182. NY	Dunkirk, NY Chadwick Bay West End Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	400,000
183. NY	Monroe County Water Authority Eastside Water Treatment Project Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	2,000,000
184. NY	Mt. Pleasant, NY Stormwater Infrastructure Improvements	138,000
185. NY	Saugerties, NY Saugerties Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	2,100,000
186. NY	Stormwater restoration project in the Town of North Hempstead, New York.	1,000,000
187. NY	Water and sewer extension project in the Town of Bethel, New York	1,000,000
188. OH	Canal Winchester, OH Village of Canal Winchester Water Treatment Plant Expansion.	500,000
189. OH	Construction of a sewer collection and treatment system in the Village of Higginsport, Ohio.	850,000
190. OH	Drinking water line replacement in Muskingum County, Ohio	200,000
191. OH	Galion, OH Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	1,000,000
192. OH	Greene Community in Greene County, Ohio for wastewater and drinking water projects.	150,000
193. OH	Wastewater collection and treatment system in the City of Elmira, Ohio, and the City of Burlington, Ohio.	800,000
194. OH	Yellow Springs, OH Morris Bean Sanitary Sewer Connection Project	125,000
195. OK	Nicoma Park, OK Nicoma Park Water Line	200,000
196. OK	Wewoka, OK City of Wewoka Well Water Access	275,000
197. OR	Sanitary district facility upgrades in the City of Winchester Bay, Oregon.	750,000
198. PA	Allegheny County Sanitary Authority for the Three Rivers Wet Weather program in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.	1,750,000
199. PA	Ambridge, PA Drinking Water Infrastructure Improvements	92,000
200. PA	Central sewer collection and treatment replacement in Tulpehocken Township, Pennsylvania.	250,000
201. PA	Combined sewer overflow and flood protection project in the City of Plum Creek and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.	800,000
202. PA	Interceptor improvements project in Penn Hills, Pennsylvania	200,000
203. PA	Kingston, PA Luzerne County Combined Sewer Overflow	1,000,000
204. PA	Pen Argyl Borough, PA Wastewater Treatment Plant	100,000
205. PA	Philadelphia, PA Southeastern Pennsylvania Waterways Restoration Stormwater Infrastructure Improvements.	695,000
206. PA	Pleasantville, PA Borough of Pleasantville Water System Improvements	300,000
207. PA	Public sewer service extensions in Menallen Township, Pennsylvania	250,000
208. PA	Sewer improvement project in the Borough of Archbald, Pennsylvania	750,000
209. PA	Storm sewer pipe construction in Millcreek Township, Pennsylvania	250,000
210. PA	Stormwater infrastructure improvements project in the Borough of Pottstown, Pennsylvania.	250,000
211. PA	Tarentum, PA Bull Creek Flood Protection Plan	1,000,000
212. PA	Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.	500,000
213. RI	Cumberland, RI Cumberland Drinking Water Infrastructure Improvements.	500,000
214. RI	New water storage tank in the Town of Westerly, Rhode Island	875,000

State	Project name	Amount
215. RI	Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Cumberland, Rhode Island.	500,000
216. RI	Water infrastructure improvements in the City of North Smithfield, Rhode Island.	200,000
217. SC	Construction of the Maple Creek Water Treatment Plant for the Greer Commission of Public Works in Greer, South Carolina.	500,000
218. SC	Myrtle Beach, SC Storm Water Management System	615,000
219. SC	Olar, SC Olar and Govan Regional Water System	733,000
220. SD	Water and wastewater master plan development in Rapid City, South Dakota.	800,000
221. SD	Water infrastructure improvements in the City of Springfield, South Dakota.	180,000
222. TN	East Tennessee Development District Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Jefferson City 700k, Norris 300k, Cumberland Gap 250k, Jefferson County 300k).	1,550,000
223. TN	Lake Tansi Sewer Project in Cumberland County, Tennessee	1,000,000
224. TN	Southeast Tennessee Development District Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (Cleveland 550k, Ducktown 150k, Spring City 250k).	950,000
225. TN	Watauga River Regional Water Authority in Carter County, Tennessee	1,000,000
226. TN	West End water and wastewater infrastructure project in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.	1,000,000
227. TX	Fresno/Arcola, TX Fort Bend County Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	2,000,000
228. TX	Liberty Hill, TX Liberty Hill Wastewater Treatment Facilities and Collection System.	365,000
229. TX	Lorena, TX City of Lorena Wastewater Treatment Plant	350,000
230. TX	Richmond/Rosenberg, TX West Fort Bend County Regional Water System.	570,000
231. TX	Sewer overflow prevention project in the City of Austin, Texas	500,000
232. UT	Arsenic and perchlorate removal project in Magna, Utah	700,000
233. UT	Construction of a drinking water nitrate remediation plant for Centerfield, Utah, and Mayfield, Utah.	1,500,000
234. UT	Drinking water and stormwater infrastructure improvements in Sandy City, Utah.	1,000,000
235. UT	Wastewater treatment plant in Eagle Mountain, Utah	500,000
236. UT	Water infrastructure improvements for Judge Tunnel in Park City, Utah	300,000
237. VA	Alexandria, VA Four Mile Run Restoration	1,500,000
238. VA	Construction of wastewater treatment facilities expansion in Lee County, Virginia.	500,000
239. VA	Hanover County, VA Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	682,000
240. VA	Henry County, VA Henry County Water System Connector to Pittsylvania County.	110,000
241. VA	National Capital Region, VA, MD, DC Real-Time Drinking Water Distribution Security Monitoring.	521,000
242. VA	Wastewater treatment infrastructure improvements project in the Town of Onancock, Virginia.	500,000
243. VT	Wastewater treatment project in the Town of Pownal, Vermont	1,000,000
244. VT	Water treatment projects in the Town of Waitsfield, Vermont	1,000,000
245. WA	Carnation, WA City of Carnation Sewer Collection and Conveyance System.	1,000,000
246. WA	Groundwater remediation project in North Clark County, Washington	500,000
247. WA	Hood Canal, WA Lower Hood Canal Wastewater Collection and Treatment System.	5,000,000
248. WI	Metropolitan sewage district interceptor system program in the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.	800,000
249. WI	Park Falls, WI Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (wells, pumphouse, water main).	1,000,000
250. WI	Pittsville, WI Wastewater Treatment Plant/Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	1,900,000
251. WI	Radionuclide standard drinking water project in the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin.	800,000
252. WI	Rhineland, WI Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements (well, pumphouse, water main, storm sewer).	1,000,000
253. WV	Beckley, WV Piney Creek Interceptor Sewer Replacement Project	1,000,000

State	Project name	Amount
254. WV	Canaan Valley, WV Canaan Valley Decentralized Wastewater System	1,000,000
255. WV	Mineral County, WV Lakewood Wastewater Treatment Facility	220,000
256. WV	Spencer, WV Spencer Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	1,000,000
257. WY	Wastewater treatment plant improvements project in the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming.	1,000,000
Total	200,000,000

Categorical Grants.—In categorical grants, there are increases of \$1,000,000 for section 106 pollution control grants, \$1,856,000 for targeted watershed grants, and \$1,200,000 for wastewater operator training, and decreases of \$934,000 for hazardous waste financial assistance, \$1,772,000 for section 319 nonpoint source grants, \$5,500,000 for section 106 water quality monitoring grants, \$854,000 for public water system supervision, \$600,000 for radon, \$15,000,000 for water quality cooperative agreements, and \$1,000,000 for wetlands program development.

Rescission.—The conference agreement modifies rescission language proposed by the House and the Senate and rescinds \$80,000,000 from expired grants, contracts and interagency agreements instead of a rescission of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and a rescission of \$58,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Although this language appears under the State and Tribal Assistance Grants heading, it applies to all EPA appropriation accounts. The conference agreement does not direct the rescinded funds to the clean water State revolving fund as proposed by the House nor does the language reference an April 2005 review by the Government Accountability Office as proposed by the House.

Other Bill Language.—Language is included making permanent the prohibition, proposed by the Senate, on the use of funds from the drinking water State revolving fund for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants. The managers note these studies are, and should continue to be, funded under the science and technology account.

Language is included, as proposed by the Senate, providing direction on the distribution of funds to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of Alaska Native villages.

Language proposed by the House referencing special project grants is included with a technical modification.

There is no earmark for the Fortuna Radar Site as proposed by the Senate.

Language is included making permanent the authority, proposed by the Senate, for States to transfer funds between the clean water and drinking water revolving funds.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the House, stipulating that special project funding from fiscal year 2000 or earlier that is not obligated on an approved grant by the end of fiscal year 2006 will be transferred to the appropriate State revolving fund. Instead, such funds that are not obligated on approved grants by September 1, 2006, are included in the rescission referenced above.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the House, providing for the transfer of excess funds after completion of spe-

cial project grants to the appropriate State revolving fund. Instead such funds are included in the rescission referenced above.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the House, transferring funds from projects that are determined to be ineligible for a grant to the appropriate State revolving fund. The managers expect EPA to keep the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations apprised of grants that are determined to be ineligible.

Language is included making permanent the authority, proposed by the House, for EPA to make technical corrections to special project grants. The Senate had similar language but used the phrase “notwithstanding any other provision of law”; whereas the House language and the language adopted in the conference agreement uses the phrase “notwithstanding this or previous appropriations Acts”.

The conference agreement includes a minor technical correction to the school bus retrofit language.

The managers agree to the following:

1. Within the funds provided for the United States-Mexico border program, \$4,000,000 is for the El Paso Utilities Board and \$3,000,000 is for the City of Brownsville water supply project.
2. Within the categorical grant targeted watersheds program, \$6,000,000 is for a regional pilot program for the Chesapeake Bay as described in Senate Report 109–80.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House regarding an exception to CERCLA relating to the qualifying date for brownfields grants or loans. The House had a single year provision. The Senate proposed to make this provision permanent.

Language is not included, which was proposed by the Senate, providing permanent authority for the use of brownfields grant funding for administrative expenses.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Section 201 modifies language, proposed by the Senate in sections 201 and 202 and by the House in section 434, dealing with human dosing studies. The managers note the many concerns expressed on both the House and Senate floors with respect to intentional human toxicity dosing studies relied upon by the EPA in reviewing applications for pesticide approvals. Concern is particularly acute for pregnant women, fetuses, and children. The managers believe this is a very serious issue that needs to be addressed by EPA as soon as possible. The managers have included statutory language that prohibits the EPA from accepting, considering, or relying on third party intentional dosing human toxicity studies for pesticides until EPA issues a final rulemaking addressing such studies. The language also requires EPA to provide for at least a 90-day public comment period on its proposed rule and to issue the final rule no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act. Such rule shall not permit the use of pregnant women, infants or children as subjects; shall be consistent with the principles proposed

in the 2004 report of the National Academy of Sciences on intentional human dosing and the principles of the Nuremberg Code with respect to human experimentation; and shall establish an independent Human Subjects Review Board.

Section 202 includes the text of Senate section 435 prohibiting the use of funds in contravention of Executive Order 12898 dealing with environmental justice. The House had a similar provision in section 432 of the House bill. The Senate provision that is included in the conference agreement includes a reference to the date of the Executive Order and to the Federal Register notice in which it was published.

Section 203 includes the text of House section 433 prohibiting the use of funds to finalize, issue, implement, or enforce the existing EPA wastewater blending policy.

Section 204 includes the text of Senate section 436 prohibiting the use of funds in contravention of 15 U.S.C. 2682(c)(3), dealing with lead-based paint, or to delay implementation of that provision of law.

Section 205 includes language, as proposed by the Senate under Administrative Provisions for the EPA, prohibiting the use of funds to publish proposed or final regulations relating to certain small engines required by section 428(b) of division G of Public Law 108–199 until the Administrator has completed and published a technical study of safety issues, including the risk of fire and burn to consumers.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

The conference agreement provides \$283,094,000 for forest and rangeland research instead of \$285,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$280,892,000 as proposed by the Senate. The forest inventory and analysis program is provided \$60,267,000 instead of \$62,100,000 recommended by the House and \$58,434,000 recommended by the Senate; this is an increase of \$4,341,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level. The managers agree to the following changes to recommendations that were proposed by the House:

Project or activity	Conference recommendation:	
	Change from House	Project total
Fixed costs	– 3,000,000	\$3,177,000
Forest inventory and analysis	– 1,833,000	60,267,000
Advanced wood structure research	0	1,500,000
Adelgid research NE station	0	1,600,000
Emerald ash borer research in Ohio	0	400,000
Southern pine beetle initiative	0	2,400,000
Coweeta, flood and landslide research	0	200,000
Coweeta, technology transfer, NC	– 150,000	296,000
Bent Creek, technology transfer, NC	150,000	150,000
Joe Skeen Inst. Montana St. Univ.	350,000	350,000
Center for bottomlands hardwoods, MS	500,000	500,000
Forest Products Laboratory salvage lumber, WI	700,000	700,000

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund				
Damage assessments.....	3,845	3,931	3,931	+86
Program management.....	1,526	1,582	1,592	+66
Restoration support.....	366	583	583	+217
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund..	5,737	6,106	6,106	+369
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES.....	729,379	815,903	782,052	+52,673
TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.....	9,955,228	9,792,069	9,926,107	-29,121
Appropriations.....	(9,881,774)	(9,822,069)	(9,956,107)	(+74,333)
Emergency appropriations.....	(103,454)	---	---	(-103,454)
Rescission.....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	---
TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY				
Science and Technology				
Air toxics and quality				
Clean air allowance trading programs (also EPM).....	8,734	9,353	8,734	---
Federal support for air quality mgmt (also EPM).....	10,521	10,016	10,016	-505
Federal support for air toxics program (also EPM)....	2,562	2,265	2,265	-297
Federal vehicle and fuels standards/certification...	57,436	66,567	59,567	+2,131
Radiation: Protection (also EPM; HSS).....	3,069	2,121	2,121	-948
Radiation: Response preparedness (also EPM).....	2,320	3,576	3,576	+1,256
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality.....	84,642	93,898	86,279	+1,637
Enforcement				
Forensics support (also HSS).....	13,048	13,737	13,737	+689
Climate protection				
Climate protection program (also EPM).....	19,006	17,732	19,032	+26
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection				
Critical infrastructure protection (except water sentinel) (also EPM; HSS).....	3,495	3,569	3,569	+74
Water sentinel and related training.....	---	44,000	9,000	+9,000
Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection.....	3,495	47,569	12,569	+9,074
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery				
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities) (also HSS).....	13,671	14,806	14,806	+1,135
Decontamination (also EPM; HSS).....	13,609	24,710	16,710	+3,101
Laboratory preparedness & response (also EPM; HSS)	---	600	600	+600
Safe buildings.....	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000
(Transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)....	(2,071)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(-71)
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery.....	27,280	44,116	36,116	+8,836
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also EPM; B&F; HSS).....				
	2,024	2,100	2,100	+76
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	32,799	93,785	50,785	+17,986
IT / Data management / Security				
IT / Data management (also EPM; LUST; OSR; HSS)....	4,345	4,251	4,251	-94
Indoor air				
Indoor air: Radon program (also EPM).....	495	442	442	-53
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program (moved to reduce risks in FY06).....	843	---	---	-843
Reduce risks from indoor air (also EPM).....	---	832	832	+832
Subtotal, Indoor air.....	1,338	1,274	1,274	-64

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Operations and administration				
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also EPM, B&F; LUST; OSR; HSS).....	8,466	8,716	8,716	+250
Pesticide licensing				
Pesticides: Registration of new pesticides (also EPH).....	2,466	2,490	2,490	+24
Pesticides: Review/Reregistration of existing pesticides (also EPH).....	2,478	2,506	2,506	+28
Subtotal, Pesticide licensing.....	4,944	4,996	4,996	+52
Research / Congressional priorities.....	65,665	---	33,275	-32,390
Research: Clean air				
Research: Air toxics.....	16,956	16,387	16,387	-569
Research: Global change.....	19,578	20,534	19,934	+356
Research: National ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).....	---	71,451	69,451	+69,451
Research: Particulate matter (Moved to NAAQS in FY06).....	60,863	---	---	-60,863
Research: Troposphere ozone.....	4,041	---	---	-4,041
Subtotal, Research: Clean air.....	101,438	108,372	105,772	+4,334
Research: Clean water				
Research: Drinking water.....	48,665	45,690	45,690	-2,975
Research: Water quality.....	44,993	55,900	51,100	+6,107
Subtotal, Research: Clean water.....	93,658	101,590	96,790	+3,132
Research: Human health and ecosystems				
Human health risk assessment.....	32,723	36,240	36,240	+3,517
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(3,559)	(4,022)	(4,022)	(+463)
Research: Computational toxicology.....	11,994	13,832	12,632	+638
Research: Endocrine disruptor.....	10,392	8,705	10,392	---
Research: Fellowships.....	12,042	8,327	12,042	---
Research: Human health and ecosystems.....	167,356	169,632	172,256	+4,900
Subtotal, Research: Human health and ecosystems	234,507	236,736	243,562	+9,055
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection & restoration (also HSS)...	9,065	13,698	11,396	+2,331
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(22,994)	(23,099)	(23,099)	(+105)
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(6,596)	(1,485)	(1,485)	(-5,111)
Subtotal, Research: Land protection.....	9,065	13,696	11,396	+2,331
Research: Sustainability				
Research: Economics and decision science (EDS).....	---	2,645	2,645	+2,645
Research: Environmental technology verification (ETV).....	3,181	3,203	3,203	+22
Research: Pollution prevention (also HSS).....	37,232	---	---	-37,232
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(588)	---	---	(-588)
Research: Sustainability (other activities).....	---	23,188	23,188	+23,188
Subtotal, Research: Sustainability.....	40,413	29,036	29,036	-11,377
Toxic research and prevention				
Research: Pesticides and toxics.....	27,792	29,753	29,753	+1,961
Water: Human health protection				
Drinking water programs (also EPM).....	2,935	3,068	3,068	+133
Total, Science and Technology.....	744,061	760,640	741,722	-2,339
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(35,808)	(30,606)	(30,606)	(-5,202)
Environmental Programs and Management				
Air toxics and quality				
Clean air allowance trading programs (also S&T).....	16,873	18,234	18,234	+1,361
Federal stationary source regulations.....	21,768	23,509	23,509	+1,741
Federal support for air quality management				
Federal support for air quality management (other activities) (also S&T).....	88,192	95,891	90,891	+2,699
Clean diesel initiative.....	---	15,000	5,000	+5,000
Subtotal, Federal support for air quality management.....	88,192	110,891	95,891	+7,699

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Federal support for air toxics program (also S&T)...	24,500	25,431	25,431	+841
Radiation: Protection (also S&T; HSS).....	11,122	11,765	11,365	+243
Radiation: Response preparedness (also S&T).....	2,624	2,636	2,636	+12
Stratospheric ozone: Domestic programs.....	5,013	3,969	5,013	---
Stratospheric ozone: Multilateral fund.....	9,920	13,500	8,900	-1,020
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality.....	180,102	209,935	190,979	+10,877
Brownfields.....	24,301	29,638	25,000	+699
Climate protection program				
Climate protection program (other activities) (also S&T).....	43,910	41,030	41,030	-2,880
Energy star.....	46,700	50,500	50,500	+3,800
Methane to markets.....	300	4,000	2,000	+1,700
Subtotal, Climate protection.....	90,910	95,530	93,530	+2,620
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers (also LUST; OSR; HSS).....	26,613	29,097	29,097	+2,484
Compliance incentives (also HSS).....	8,963	9,622	9,622	+659
Compliance monitoring (also HSS) (Some of these funds were in IT/Data management in FY05).....	66,328	93,412	87,328	+21,000
Subtotal, Compliance.....	101,904	132,131	126,047	+24,143
Enforcement				
Civil enforcement (also OSR; HSS).....	112,463	117,462	115,962	+3,499
Criminal enforcement (also HSS).....	39,101	37,326	38,226	-875
Enforcement training (also HSS).....	3,428	2,499	2,999	-429
Environmental justice (also HSS).....	5,883	3,980	5,883	---
NEPA implementation.....	12,039	12,440	12,440	+401
Subtotal, Enforcement.....	172,914	173,707	175,510	+2,596
Environmental protection / Congressional priorities...	92,326	---	50,543	-41,783
Geographic programs				
Geographic program: Chesapeake Bay.....	22,756	20,746	22,746	-10
Geographic program: Great Lakes.....	21,287	21,519	21,519	+232
Geographic program: Gulf of Mexico.....	3,895	4,468	5,000	+1,105
Geographic program: Lake Champlain.....	2,480	955	1,955	-525
Geographic program: Long Island Sound.....	2,332	477	477	-1,855
Geographic program: Puget Sound.....	---	---	2,000	+2,000
Geographic program: Other				
Community action for a renewed environment (CARE).....	1,984	9,000	3,000	+1,016
Other (other activities).....	4,923	4,686	5,853	+930
Subtotal, Geographic program: Other.....	6,907	13,686	8,853	+1,946
Regional geographic initiatives.....	7,687	8,862	7,762	+75
Subtotal, Geographic programs.....	87,344	70,713	70,312	+2,968
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Communication and information (also HSS)				
Communication and information (other activities)...	5,133	5,450	5,450	+317
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T)...	---	1,230	1,230	+1,230
Subtotal, Homeland security: Communication and information.....	5,133	6,680	6,680	+1,547
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection				
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination) (also S&T; HSS).....	6,896	6,847	6,847	-49
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	---	100	100	+100
Subtotal, Homeland security: critical infrastructure protection.....	6,896	6,947	6,947	+51

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery (also S&T; HSS)				
Decontamination (also S&T; EPH; HSS).....	1,822	3,348	3,348	+1,526
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; B&F; HSS)				
	6,294	6,403	6,403	+109
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	20,145	23,378	23,378	+3,233
Indoor air				
Indoor air: Asthma program.....	10,468	---	---	-10,468
Indoor air: Environment tobacco smoke program.....	2,400	---	---	-2,400
Indoor air: Radon program (also S&T).....	5,142	5,918	5,518	+376
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program.....	9,326	---	---	-9,326
Reduce risks from indoor air (also S&T).....	---	23,496	23,496	+23,496
Subtotal, Indoor air.....	27,336	29,414	29,014	+1,678
Information exchange / Outreach				
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination.....	5,970	6,890	6,890	+920
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations (also HSS).....	48,624	49,753	49,753	+1,129
Environmental education.....	8,957	---	9,000	+43
Exchange network (also HSS).....	16,361	22,739	18,739	+2,378
Small business ombudsman.....	3,712	3,911	3,911	+199
Small minority business assistance.....	2,264	2,348	2,348	+84
State and local prevention and preparedness.....	11,855	12,328	11,928	+73
Toxics release inventory (TRI) / Right to know.....	14,310	14,754	14,754	+444
Tribal - Capacity building.....	10,640	11,049	11,049	+409
Subtotal, Information exchange / Outreach.....	122,693	123,772	128,372	+5,679
International programs				
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination.....	244	---	---	-244
Commission for environmental cooperation.....	3,773	4,210	4,210	+437
Environment and trade.....	1,500	1,787	1,787	+287
International capacity building.....	5,751	6,450	6,200	+449
Persistent organic pollutants (POPs) implementation.....	1,627	2,806	1,806	+179
U.S. / Mexico border.....	5,612	5,975	5,975	+363
Subtotal, International programs.....	18,507	21,228	19,978	+1,471
IT / Data management / Security				
Information security (also HSS).....	4,131	3,888	3,888	-243
IT / Data management (also S&T; LUST; OSR; HSS) (\$22.59 million moved to EPH Compliance in FY06).....	106,123	105,999	95,999	-10,124
Subtotal, IT / Data management / Security.....	110,254	109,887	99,887	-10,367
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review				
Administrative law.....	4,890	5,109	5,109	+219
Alternative dispute resolution (also HSS).....	931	1,051	1,051	+120
Civil rights / Title VI compliance.....	12,119	12,530	12,530	+411
Legal advice: Environmental program (also HSS).....	34,644	36,314	36,314	+1,670
Legal advice: Support program.....	12,555	13,088	13,088	+533
Regional science and technology.....	3,245	3,643	3,643	+398
Regulatory innovation.....	20,014	25,021	22,518	+2,504
Regulatory/Economic management and analysis.....	14,821	16,713	16,713	+1,892
Science advisory board.....	4,361	4,881	4,881	+520
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review.....	107,580	118,350	115,847	+8,267
Operations and administration				
Acquisition management (also LUST; HSS).....	22,714	23,055	23,055	+341
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also LUST; HSS).....	69,387	72,790	72,790	+3,403
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; B&F; LUST; OSR; HSS).....	314,614	358,046	353,046	+38,432
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements (IAG) management (also HSS).....	20,366	19,916	19,916	-450
Human resources management (also LUST; HSS).....	39,461	38,872	38,872	-589
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	466,542	512,679	507,679	+41,137

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Pesticide licensing				
Pesticides: Field programs.....	24,362	24,683	24,683	+321
Pesticides: Registration of new pesticides (also S&T).....	39,159	41,472	41,472	+2,313
Pesticides: Review/Reregistration of existing pesticides (also S&T).....	51,315	57,991	57,991	+6,676
Science policy and biotechnology.....	1,640	1,751	1,751	+111
Subtotal, Pesticide licensing.....	116,476	125,897	125,897	+9,421
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)				
RCRA: Corrective action.....	39,667	42,710	42,710	+3,043
RCRA: Waste management.....	66,696	68,228	68,228	+1,532
RCRA: Waste minimization and recycling.....	11,508	14,376	14,376	+2,868
RCRA: General reduction.....	---	---	-5,000	-5,000
Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).....	117,871	125,314	120,314	+2,443
Toxics risk review and prevention				
Toxic substances: Chemical risk management.....	8,341	9,058	9,058	+717
Toxic substances: Chemical risk review & reduction.....	44,814	44,523	46,879	+2,065
Endocrine disruptors.....	8,540	9,097	9,097	+557
Toxic substances: Lead risk reduction program.....	10,970	10,549	10,549	-421
Pollution prevention program.....	16,408	19,990	16,408	---
Subtotal, Toxics risk review and prevention.....	89,073	93,217	91,991	+2,918
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST) (also LUST)....	7,125	7,719	7,719	+594
Water: Ecosystems				
Great Lakes Legacy Act.....	22,320	50,000	30,000	+7,680
National estuary program / Coastal waterways.....	25,065	19,446	24,446	-619
Wetlands.....	20,085	20,375	20,375	+290
Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems.....	67,470	89,821	74,821	+7,351
Water: Human health protection				
Beach/Fish programs.....	3,210	3,264	3,264	+54
Drinking water programs (also S&T).....	93,258	101,090	96,590	+3,332
Subtotal, Water: Human health protection.....	96,468	104,354	99,854	+3,386
Water quality protection				
Marine pollution.....	11,358	12,279	12,279	+921
Surface water protection				
Surface water protection (other activities).....	179,503	185,501	185,501	+5,998
Water quality monitoring.....	6,700	9,300	7,300	+600
Subtotal, Surface water protection.....	186,203	194,801	192,801	+6,598
Subtotal, Water quality protection.....	197,561	207,080	205,080	+7,519
Subtotal, Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,294,902	2,403,764	2,381,752	+86,850
Offsetting receipts from toxics and pesticides fees...	---	-50,000	---	---
Total, Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,294,902	2,353,764	2,381,752	+86,850
Office of Inspector General				
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	37,696	36,955	37,455	-241
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)....	(12,896)	(13,536)	(13,536)	(+640)
Buildings and Facilities				
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; EPH; HSS).....	11,408	11,500	11,500	+92
Operations and administration				
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPH; HSS; LUST; OSR).....	27,280	28,718	28,718	+1,438
Subtotal, Buildings and Facilities.....	38,688	40,218	40,218	+1,530

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	3,000	---	---	-3,000
Total, Buildings and Facilities.....	41,688	40,218	40,218	-1,470
Hazardous Substance Superfund				
Air toxics and quality				
Radiation: Protection (also S&T; EPM).....	2,031	2,387	2,212	+181
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	12,896	13,536	13,536	+640
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General).....	(-12,896)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-640)
Enforcement				
Civil enforcement (also EPM; OSR).....	122	883	883	+761
Criminal enforcement (also EPM).....	7,895	9,504	8,704	+809
Enforcement training (also EPM).....	822	614	614	-208
Environmental justice (also EPM).....	938	845	845	-93
Forensics support (also S&T).....	4,112	3,840	3,840	-272
Superfund: Enforcement.....	153,266	164,258	160,258	+6,992
Superfund: Federal facilities enforcement.....	10,667	10,241	10,241	-426
Subtotal, Enforcement.....	177,822	190,185	185,365	+7,563
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; LUST; OSR).....	---	23	12	+12
Compliance incentives (also EPM).....	145	168	157	+12
Compliance monitoring (also EPM).....	159	1,157	957	+798
Subtotal, Compliance.....	304	1,348	1,126	+822
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Communication and information (also EPM)				
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	---	300	300	+300
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection				
Critical infrastructure protection (other activities) (also S&T; EPM).....	1,923	852	852	-1,071
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	---	200	200	+200
Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection.....	1,923	1,052	1,052	-871
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery				
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	8,283	12,550	10,550	+2,267
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	---	9,500	---	---
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities) (also S&T).....	25,996	26,915	26,915	+919
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-2,071)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	(+71)
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery.....	34,279	48,965	37,465	+3,186
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; EPM; B&F).....	672	600	600	-72
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	36,874	50,917	39,417	+2,543
Information exchange / Outreach				
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations (also EPM).....	155	161	155	---
Exchange network (also EPM).....	2,235	1,676	1,676	-559
Subtotal, Information exchange / Outreach.....	2,390	1,837	1,831	-559
IT / Data management / Security				
Information security (also EPM).....	406	409	406	---
IT / Data management (also S&T; EPM; LUST; OSR).....	17,945	16,113	16,113	-1,832
Subtotal, IT / Data management / Security.....	18,351	16,522	16,519	-1,832

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review				
Alternative dispute resolution (also EPM).....	845	985	985	+140
Legal advice: Environmental program (also EPM).....	816	836	836	+20
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review.....	1,661	1,821	1,821	+160
Operations and administration				
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements (IAG) management (also EPM).....	2,943	2,579	2,579	-364
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; LUST; OSR).....	67,080	72,726	70,226	+3,146
Acquisition management (also EPM; LUST).....	18,888	20,367	20,367	+1,479
Human resources management (also EPM; LUST).....	4,376	4,790	4,790	+414
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also EPM; LUST).....	20,379	22,445	22,445	+2,066
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	113,666	122,907	120,407	+6,741
Research: Human health and ecosystems				
Human health risk assessment.....	3,559	4,022	4,022	+463
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-3,559)	(-4,022)	(-4,022)	(-463)
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration.....	22,994	23,099	23,099	+105
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-22,994)	(-23,099)	(-23,099)	(-105)
Research: Superfund innovative technology (SITE) program.....	6,596	1,485	1,485	-5,111
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-6,596)	(-1,485)	(-1,485)	(+5,111)
Subtotal, Research, Land protection.....	29,590	24,584	24,584	-5,006
Research: Sustainability				
Pollution prevention (also S&T).....	588	---	---	-588
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-588)	---	---	(+588)
Superfund cleanup				
Superfund: Emergency response and removal.....	198,494	198,000	198,494	---
Superfund: EPA emergency preparedness.....	10,009	10,507	10,507	+498
Superfund: Federal facilities.....	31,512	31,611	31,611	+99
Superfund: Remedial.....	597,139	599,395	599,395	+2,256
Superfund: Support to other Federal agencies.....	10,591	9,754	9,754	-837
Subtotal, Superfund cleanup.....	847,745	849,267	849,761	+2,016
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,247,477	1,279,333	1,260,621	+13,144
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General).....	(-12,896)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-640)
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-35,808)	(-30,606)	(-30,606)	(+5,202)
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)				
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; OSR; HSS).....	855	774	774	-81
IT / Data management / Security				
IT / Data management (also S&T; EPM; HSS; OSR).....	176	178	178	+2
Operations and administration				
Acquisition management (also EPM; HSS).....	341	346	346	+5
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also EPM; HSS).....	866	936	936	+70
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; HSS; OSR).....	872	884	884	+12
Human resources management (also EPM; HSS).....	3	3	3	---
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	2,082	2,169	2,169	+87
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration (also S&T; HSS; OSR).....	624	646	646	+22

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)				
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST) (also EPM)...	9,279	10,584	10,584	+1,305
LUST Cooperative agreements.....	56,424	58,676	58,676	+2,252
Subtotal, Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)	65,703	69,260	69,260	+3,557
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program.	69,440	73,027	73,027	+3,587
Oil Spill Response				
Enforcement				
Civil enforcement (also EPM; HSS).....	1,742	1,789	1,789	+47
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; HSS; LUST).....	274	287	287	+13
IT / Data management / Security				
IT / Data management (also S&T; EPM; HSS; LUST).....	33	33	33	---
Oil				
Oil spill: Prevention, preparedness and response...	12,465	12,344	12,344	-121
Operations and administration				
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; HSS; LUST).....	463	504	504	+41
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration (also S&T; HSS; LUST).....	895	906	906	+11
Total, Oil Spill Response.....	15,872	15,863	15,863	-9
Pesticide registration fund.....	19,245	15,000	15,000	-4,245
Pesticide registration fees.....	-19,245	-15,000	-15,000	+4,245
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)				
Air toxics and quality				
Clean school bus initiative.....	7,440	10,000	7,000	-440
Brownfields				
Brownfields projects.....	89,280	120,500	90,000	+720
Infrastructure assistance				
Infrastructure assistance: Alaska Native villages..	44,640	15,000	35,000	-9,640
Infrastructure assistance: Clean water state revolving fund (SRF).....	1,091,200	730,000	900,000	-191,200
Infrastructure assistance: Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF).....	843,200	850,000	850,000	+6,800
Infrastructure assistance: Mexico border.....	49,600	50,000	50,000	+400
Infrastructure assistance: Puerto Rico.....	3,849	4,000	---	-3,849
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance.....	2,032,489	1,649,000	1,835,000	-187,489
STAG infrastructure grants / Congressional priorities.	309,548	---	200,000	-109,548
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (excluding categorical grants).....	2,438,757	1,779,500	2,132,000	-306,757
Categorical grants				
Categorical grant: Beaches protection.....	9,920	10,000	10,000	+80
Categorical grant: Brownfields.....	49,600	60,000	50,000	+400
Categorical grant: Environmental information.....	19,344	20,000	20,000	+656
Categorical grant: Hazardous waste financial assistance.....	103,466	104,400	103,466	---
Categorical grant: Homeland security.....	4,960	5,000	5,000	+40
Categorical grant: Lead.....	13,392	13,700	13,700	+308
Categorical grant: Nonpoint source (Sec. 319).....	207,328	209,100	207,328	---
Categorical grant: Pesticides enforcement.....	19,344	18,900	18,900	-444
Categorical grant: Pesticides program implementation.....	12,896	13,100	13,100	+204

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106)				
Pollution control (Sec. 106) (other activities)....	168,620	177,900	170,900	+2,280
Water quality monitoring.....	39,700	54,000	48,500	+8,800
Subtotal, Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106).....	208,320	231,900	219,400	+11,080
Categorical grant: Pollution prevention.....	4,960	6,000	5,000	+40
Categorical grant: Public water system supervision (PWSS).....	99,746	100,600	99,746	---
Categorical grant: Radon.....	6,944	8,150	7,550	+606
Categorical grant: Sector program.....	2,232	2,250	2,250	+18
Categorical grant: State and local air quality management.....	223,200	223,550	223,550	+350
Categorical grant: State and tribal performance fund.....	---	23,000	---	---
Categorical grant: Targeted watersheds.....	17,856	15,000	16,856	-1,000
Categorical grant: Toxics substances compliance....	5,007	5,150	5,150	+143
Categorical grant: Tribal air quality management....	10,743	11,050	11,050	+307
Categorical grant: Tribal general assistance program.....	61,504	57,500	57,500	-4,004
Categorical grant: Underground injection control (UIC).....	10,694	11,000	11,000	+306
Categorical grant: Underground storage tanks.....	11,904	11,950	11,950	+46
Categorical grant: Wastewater operator training....	1,488	---	1,200	-288
Categorical grant: Water quality cooperative agreements.....	16,864	---	---	-16,864
Categorical grant: Wetlands program development....	14,880	20,000	16,000	+1,120
Subtotal, Categorical grants.....	1,136,592	1,181,300	1,129,696	-6,896
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants....	3,575,349	2,960,800	3,261,696	-313,653
Rescission of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements (various EPA accounts).....	---	---	-80,000	-80,000
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,575,349	2,960,800	3,181,696	-393,653
TOTAL, TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,026,485	7,520,600	7,732,354	-294,131
Appropriations.....	(8,023,485)	(7,520,600)	(7,812,354)	(-211,131)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,000)	---	---	(-3,000)
Rescissions.....	---	---	(-80,000)	(-80,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-48,704)	(-44,142)	(-44,142)	(+4,562)
(By transfer).....	(48,704)	(44,142)	(44,142)	(-4,562)
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES				
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
FOREST SERVICE				
Forest and Rangeland Research				
Forest inventory and analysis.....	55,926	68,714	60,267	+4,341
Research and development programs.....	220,458	216,686	222,827	+2,369
Total, Forest and rangeland research.....	276,384	285,400	283,094	+6,710
State and Private Forestry				
Forest Health Management				
Federal lands forest health management.....	54,236	50,023	54,236	---
Cooperative lands forest health management.....	47,629	22,308	47,629	---
Subtotal, Forest Health Management.....	101,865	72,331	101,865	---
Cooperative Fire Protection				
State fire assistance.....	32,920	20,919	33,422	+502
Volunteer fire assistance.....	5,917	5,917	6,000	+83
Subtotal, Cooperative Fire Protection.....	38,837	26,836	39,422	+585

109TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2361

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior,
environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year
ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any
2 money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the
3 Department of the Interior, environment, and related
4 agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006,
5 and for other purposes, namely:

6 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

7 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

8 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

9 For necessary expenses for protection, use, improve-
10 ment, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classi-
11 fication, acquisition of easements and other interests in
12 lands, and performance of other functions, including main-
13 tenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the manage-
14 ment of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction
15 of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general
16 administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral
17 potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96–487
18 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$845,783,000, to remain available
19 until expended, of which \$1,000,000 is for high priority
20 projects, to be carried out by the Youth Conservation
21 Corps; and of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal
22 year 2006 subject to a match by at least an equal amount
23 by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-
24 shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands;
25 and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as

1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

2 For environmental programs and management, in-
3 cluding necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for
4 personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including
5 uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5
6 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
7 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per
8 diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for sen-
9 ior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger
10 motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of air-
11 craft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in soci-
12 eties or associations which issue publications to members
13 only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers
14 who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, re-
15 habilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed
16 \$85,000 per project; and not to exceed \$9,000 for official
17 reception and representation expenses, \$2,389,491,000
18 (increased by \$1,903,000) (reduced by \$1,903,000), which
19 shall remain available until September 30, 2007, including
20 administrative costs of the brownfields program under the
21 Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revital-
22 ization Act of 2002.

23 OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

24 For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector
25 General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector
26 General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction,

1 alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facili-
2 ties, not to exceed \$85,000 per project, \$37,955,000 to
3 remain available until September 30, 2007.

4 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

5 For construction, repair, improvement, extension, al-
6 teration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of,
7 or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency,
8 \$40,218,000 to remain available until expended.

9 HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

10 (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

11 For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehen-
12 sive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liabil-
13 ity Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sec-
14 tions 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C.
15 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilita-
16 tion, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000
17 per project; \$1,258,333,000, to remain available until ex-
18 pended, consisting of such sums as are available in the
19 Trust Fund upon the date of enactment of this Act as
20 authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amend-
21 ments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up
22 to \$1,258,333,000 as a payment from general revenues
23 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as
24 authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Pro-*
25 *vided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may
26 be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with

1 section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the
2 funds appropriated under this heading, \$13,536,000 shall
3 be transferred to the “Office of Inspector General” appro-
4 priation to remain available until September 30, 2007,
5 and \$30,606,000 shall be transferred to the “Science and
6 technology” appropriation to remain available until Sep-
7 tember 30, 2007.

8 LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

9 For necessary expenses to carry out leaking under-
10 ground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by sec-
11 tion 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthoriza-
12 tion Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair,
13 rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed
14 \$85,000 per project, \$73,027,000, to remain available
15 until expended.

16 OIL SPILL RESPONSE

17 For expenses necessary to carry out the Environ-
18 mental Protection Agency’s responsibilities under the Oil
19 Pollution Act of 1990, \$15,863,000, to be derived from
20 the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until
21 expended.

22 STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

23 (INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

24 For environmental programs and infrastructure as-
25 sistance, including capitalization grants for State revolv-
26 ing funds and performance partnership grants,

1 \$3,127,800,000, to remain available until expended, of
2 which \$750,000,000 shall be for making capitalization
3 grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under
4 title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as
5 amended (the “Act”), of which up to \$50,000,000 shall
6 be available for loans, including interest free loans as au-
7 thorized by 33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)(A), to municipal, inter-
8 municipal, interstate, or State agencies or nonprofit enti-
9 ties for projects that provide treatment for or that mini-
10 mize sewage or stormwater discharges using one or more
11 approaches which include, but are not limited to, decen-
12 tralized or distributed stormwater controls, decentralized
13 wastewater treatment, low-impact development practices,
14 conservation easements, stream buffers, or wetlands res-
15 toration; \$850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants
16 for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under sec-
17 tion 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended;
18 \$50,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, plan-
19 ning, design, construction and related activities in connec-
20 tion with the construction of high priority water and
21 wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mex-
22 ico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border
23 commission; \$15,000,000 shall be for grants to the State
24 of Alaska to address drinking water and waste infrastruc-
25 ture needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages;

1 \$200,000,000 shall be for making grants for the construc-
2 tion of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infra-
3 structure and for water quality protection (“special project
4 grants”) in accordance with the terms and conditions
5 specified for such grants in the joint explanatory state-
6 ment of the managers accompanying this Act, and, for
7 purposes of these grants, each grantee shall contribute not
8 less than 45 percent of the cost of the project unless the
9 grantee is approved for a waiver by the Agency;
10 \$95,500,000 (increased by \$2,000,000) shall be to carry
11 out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental
12 Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980
13 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency
14 agreements, and associated program support costs;
15 \$4,000,000 shall be for a grant to Puerto Rico for drink-
16 ing water infrastructure improvements to the
17 Metropolitan community water system in San Juan;
18 \$10,000,000 for cost-shared grants for school bus retrofit
19 and replacement projects that reduce diesel emissions:
20 *Provided*, That \$1,153,300,000 (reduced by \$2,000,000)
21 shall be for grants, including associated program support
22 costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate
23 agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agen-
24 cies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention,
25 control and abatement and related activities, including ac-

1 tivities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this
2 heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants
3 under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate
4 matter monitoring and data collection activities of which
5 and subject to terms and conditions specified by the Ad-
6 ministrator, of which \$52,000,000 (reduced by
7 \$2,000,000) shall be for carrying out section 128 of
8 CERCLA, as amended, and \$20,000,000 shall be for En-
9 vironmental Information Exchange Network grants, in-
10 cluding associated program support costs, and
11 \$15,000,000 shall be for making competitive targeted wa-
12 tershed grants: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding
13 section 603(d)(7) of the Act, the limitation on the
14 amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund
15 that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall
16 not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made
17 by such fund in fiscal year 2006 and prior years where
18 such amounts represent costs of administering the fund
19 to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed rea-
20 sonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately
21 from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible pur-
22 poses of the fund, including administration: *Provided fur-*
23 *ther*, That for fiscal year 2006, and notwithstanding sec-
24 tion 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to
25 use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under

1 section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes
2 pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Pro-*
3 *vided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding
4 the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act,
5 up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated
6 for State Revolving Funds under title VI of that Act may
7 be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section
8 518(c) of that Act: *Provided further*, That no funds pro-
9 vided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater
10 and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in
11 the United States along the United States-Mexico border
12 shall be made available to a county or municipal govern-
13 ment unless that government has established an enforce-
14 able local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents
15 in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any
16 additional colonia areas, or the development within an ex-
17 isting colonia the construction of any new home, business,
18 or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other
19 necessary infrastructure: *Provided further*, That, notwith-
20 standing any other provision of law, such funds that were
21 appropriated under this heading for special project grants
22 in fiscal year 2000 or before and for which the Agency
23 has not received an application and issued a grant by Sep-
24 tember 30, 2006, shall be made available to the Clean
25 Water or Drinking Water Revolving Fund, as appropriate,

1 for the State in which the special project grant recipient
2 is located: *Provided further*, That excess funds remaining
3 after completion of a special project grant shall be made
4 available to the Clean Water or Drinking Water Revolving
5 Fund, as appropriate, for the State in which the special
6 project grant recipient is located: *Provided further*, That
7 in the event that a special project is determined by the
8 Agency to be ineligible for a grant, the funds for that
9 project shall be made available to the Clean Water or
10 Drinking Water Revolving Fund, as appropriate, for the
11 State in which the special project grant recipient is lo-
12 cated: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding this or pre-
13 vious appropriations Acts, after consultation with the
14 House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and for
15 the purposes of making technical corrections, the Adminis-
16 trator is authorized to award grants to entities under this
17 heading for purposes other than those listed in the joint
18 explanatory statements of the managers accompanying the
19 Agency's appropriations Acts for the construction of
20 drinking water, waste water and storm water infrastruc-
21 ture, and for water quality protection.

22 For an additional amount for the Clean Water State
23 Revolving Fund, \$100,000,000 shall be made available
24 from the rescissions of multi-year and no-year funding,
25 previously appropriated to the Environmental Protection

1 Agency, the availability of which under the original appro-
2 priation accounts has not expired, and \$100,000,000 in
3 such funding is hereby rescinded: *Provided*, That such re-
4 scissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated
5 with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose
6 availability under the original period for obligation for
7 such grant, contract, or interagency agreement has ex-
8 pired based on the April 2005 review by the Government
9 Accountability Office.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11 For fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C.
12 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environ-
13 mental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's
14 function to implement directly Federal environmental pro-
15 grams required or authorized by law in the absence of an
16 acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agree-
17 ments to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal
18 consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist
19 the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental
20 programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law,
21 except that no such cooperative agreements may be award-
22 ed from funds designated for State financial assistance
23 agreements.

24 The Administrator of the Environmental Protection
25 Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide reg-
26 istration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the

1 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as
2 added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration
3 Improvement Act of 2003), as amended.

4 Notwithstanding CERCLA 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV), ap-
5 propriated funds for fiscal year 2006 may be used to
6 award grants or loans under section 104(k) of CERCLA
7 to eligible entities that satisfy all of the elements set forth
8 in CERCLA section 101(40) to qualify as a bona fide pro-
9 spective purchaser except that the date of acquisition of
10 the property was prior to the date of enactment of the
11 Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitaliza-
12 tion Act of 2001.

13 For fiscal years 2006 through 2011, the Adminis-
14 trator may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel
15 Management, make not to exceed five appointments in any
16 fiscal year under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209
17 for the Office of Research and Development.

18 TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

19 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

20 FOREST SERVICE

21 FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

22 For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland re-
23 search as authorized by law, \$285,000,000, to remain
24 available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds pro-

1 PRESIDIO TRUST

2 PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

3 For necessary expenses to carry out title I of the Om-
4 nibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996,
5 \$20,000,000 shall be available to the Presidio Trust, to
6 remain available until expended.

7 WHITE HOUSE COMMISSION ON THE NATIONAL

8 MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE

9 For necessary expenses of the White House Commis-
10 sion on the National Moment of Remembrance, \$250,000.

11 TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 SEC. 401. The expenditure of any appropriation
13 under this Act for any consulting service through procure-
14 ment contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited
15 to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter
16 of public record and available for public inspection, except
17 where otherwise provided under existing law, or under ex-
18 isting Executive Order issued pursuant to existing law.

19 SEC. 402. No part of any appropriation contained in
20 this Act shall be available for any activity or the publica-
21 tion or distribution of literature that in any way tends to
22 promote public support or opposition to any legislative
23 proposal on which Congressional action is not complete.

1 SEC. 403. No part of any appropriation contained in
2 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
3 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

4 SEC. 404. None of the funds provided in this Act to
5 any department or agency shall be obligated or expended
6 to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal
7 servants to any officer or employee of such department
8 or agency except as otherwise provided by law.

9 SEC. 405. No assessments may be levied against any
10 program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by
11 this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis
12 therefor are presented to the Committees on Appropria-
13 tions and are approved by such committees.

14 SEC. 406. None of the funds in this Act may be used
15 to plan, prepare, or offer for sale timber from trees classi-
16 fied as giant sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) which
17 are located on National Forest System or Bureau of Land
18 Management lands in a manner different than such sales
19 were conducted in fiscal year 2004.

20 SEC. 407. (a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the
21 funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant
22 to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or
23 process applications for a patent for any mining or mill
24 site claim located under the general mining laws.

1 (b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (a)
2 shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines
3 that, for the claim concerned: (1) a patent application was
4 filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994;
5 and (2) all requirements established under sections 2325
6 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30)
7 for vein or lode claims and sections 2329, 2330, 2331,
8 and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and
9 37) for placer claims, and section 2337 of the Revised
10 Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case
11 may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that
12 date.

13 (c) REPORT.—On September 30, 2006, the Secretary
14 of the Interior shall file with the House and Senate Com-
15 mittees on Appropriations and the Committee on Re-
16 sources of the House of Representatives and the Com-
17 mittee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate
18 a report on actions taken by the Department under the
19 plan submitted pursuant to section 314(e) of the Depart-
20 ment of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations
21 Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208).

22 (d) MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.—In order to process
23 patent applications in a timely and responsible manner,
24 upon the request of a patent applicant, the Secretary of
25 the Interior shall allow the applicant to fund a qualified

1 third-party contractor to be selected by the Bureau of
2 Land Management to conduct a mineral examination of
3 the mining claims or mill sites contained in a patent appli-
4 cation as set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau of Land
5 Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose
6 and pay the third-party contractor in accordance with the
7 standard procedures employed by the Bureau of Land
8 Management in the retention of third-party contractors.

9 SEC. 408. Notwithstanding any other provision of
10 law, amounts appropriated to or earmarked in committee
11 reports for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian
12 Health Service by Public Laws 103-138, 103-332, 104-
13 134, 104-208, 105-83, 105-277, 106-113, 106-291,
14 107-63, 108-7, 108-108, and 108-447 for payments to
15 tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs
16 associated with self-determination or self-governance con-
17 tracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements
18 with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health
19 Service as funded by such Acts, are the total amounts
20 available for fiscal years 1994 through 2005 for such pur-
21 poses, except that, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, tribes
22 and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allo-
23 cations for unmet contract support costs of ongoing con-
24 tracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding
25 agreements.

1 SEC. 409. Of the funds provided to the National En-
2 dowment for the Arts:

3 (1) The Chairperson shall only award a grant
4 to an individual if such grant is awarded to such in-
5 dividual for a literature fellowship, National Herit-
6 age Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellow-
7 ship.

8 (2) The Chairperson shall establish procedures
9 to ensure that no funding provided through a grant,
10 except a grant made to a State or local arts agency,
11 or regional group, may be used to make a grant to
12 any other organization or individual to conduct ac-
13 tivity independent of the direct grant recipient.
14 Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit payments
15 made in exchange for goods and services.

16 (3) No grant shall be used for seasonal support
17 to a group, unless the application is specific to the
18 contents of the season, including identified programs
19 and/or projects.

20 SEC. 410. The National Endowment for the Arts and
21 the National Endowment for the Humanities are author-
22 ized to solicit, accept, receive, and invest in the name of
23 the United States, gifts, bequests, or devises of money and
24 other property or services and to use such in furtherance
25 of the functions of the National Endowment for the Arts

1 and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Any
2 proceeds from such gifts, bequests, or devises, after ac-
3 ceptance by the National Endowment for the Arts or the
4 National Endowment for the Humanities, shall be paid by
5 the donor or the representative of the donor to the Chair-
6 man. The Chairman shall enter the proceeds in a special
7 interest-bearing account to the credit of the appropriate
8 endowment for the purposes specified in each case.

9 SEC. 411. (a) In providing services or awarding fi-
10 nancial assistance under the National Foundation on the
11 Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 from funds appro-
12 priated under this Act, the Chairperson of the National
13 Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given
14 to providing services or awarding financial assistance for
15 projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve
16 underserved populations.

17 (b) In this section:

18 (1) The term “underserved population” means
19 a population of individuals, including urban minori-
20 ties, who have historically been outside the purview
21 of arts and humanities programs due to factors such
22 as a high incidence of income below the poverty line
23 or to geographic isolation.

24 (2) The term “poverty line” means the poverty
25 line (as defined by the Office of Management and

1 Budget, and revised annually in accordance with sec-
2 tion 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant
3 Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of
4 the size involved.

5 (c) In providing services and awarding financial as-
6 sistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and
7 Humanities Act of 1965 with funds appropriated by this
8 Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the
9 Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing serv-
10 ices or awarding financial assistance for projects, produc-
11 tions, workshops, or programs that will encourage public
12 knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of
13 the arts.

14 (d) With funds appropriated by this Act to carry out
15 section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Hu-
16 manities Act of 1965—

17 (1) the Chairperson shall establish a grant cat-
18 egory for projects, productions, workshops, or pro-
19 grams that are of national impact or availability or
20 are able to tour several States;

21 (2) the Chairperson shall not make grants ex-
22 ceeding 15 percent, in the aggregate, of such funds
23 to any single State, excluding grants made under the
24 authority of paragraph (1);

1 (3) the Chairperson shall report to the Con-
2 gress annually and by State, on grants awarded by
3 the Chairperson in each grant category under sec-
4 tion 5 of such Act; and

5 (4) the Chairperson shall encourage the use of
6 grants to improve and support community-based
7 music performance and education.

8 SEC. 412. No part of any appropriation contained in
9 this Act shall be expended or obligated to complete and
10 issue the 5-year program under the Forest and Rangeland
11 Renewable Resources Planning Act.

12 SEC. 413. Amounts deposited during fiscal year 2005
13 in the roads and trails fund provided for in the 14th para-
14 graph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” of the
15 Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 843; 16 U.S.C. 501), shall
16 be used by the Secretary of Agriculture, without regard
17 to the State in which the amounts were derived, to repair
18 or reconstruct roads, bridges, and trails on National For-
19 est System lands or to carry out and administer projects
20 to improve forest health conditions, which may include the
21 repair or reconstruction of roads, bridges, and trails on
22 National Forest System lands in the wildland-community
23 interface where there is an abnormally high risk of fire.
24 The projects shall emphasize reducing risks to human
25 safety and public health and property and enhancing eco-

1 logical functions, long-term forest productivity, and bio-
2 logical integrity. The projects may be completed in a sub-
3 sequent fiscal year. Funds shall not be expended under
4 this section to replace funds which would otherwise appro-
5 priately be expended from the timber salvage sale fund.
6 Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt any
7 project from any environmental law.

8 SEC. 414. Other than in emergency situations, none
9 of the funds in this Act may be used to operate telephone
10 answering machines during core business hours unless
11 such answering machines include an option that enables
12 callers to reach promptly an individual on-duty with the
13 agency being contacted.

14 SEC. 415. Prior to October 1, 2006, the Secretary
15 of Agriculture shall not be considered to be in violation
16 of subparagraph 6(f)(5)(A) of the Forest and Rangeland
17 Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C.
18 1604(f)(5)(A)) solely because more than 15 years have
19 passed without revision of the plan for a unit of the Na-
20 tional Forest System. Nothing in this section exempts the
21 Secretary from any other requirement of the Forest and
22 Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (16 U.S.C.
23 1600 et seq.) or any other law: *Provided*, That if the Sec-
24 retary is not acting expeditiously and in good faith, within
25 the funding available, to revise a plan for a unit of the

1 National Forest System, this section shall be void with re-
2 spect to such plan and a court of proper jurisdiction may
3 order completion of the plan on an accelerated basis.

4 SEC. 416. No funds provided in this Act may be ex-
5 pended to conduct preleasing, leasing and related activities
6 under either the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et
7 seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C.
8 1331 et seq.) within the boundaries of a National Monu-
9 ment established pursuant to the Act of June 8, 1906 (16
10 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) as such boundary existed on January
11 20, 2001, except where such activities are allowed under
12 the Presidential proclamation establishing such monu-
13 ment.

14 SEC. 417. EXTENSION OF FOREST SERVICE CONVEY-
15 ANCES PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 329 of the Department
16 of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act,
17 2002 (16 U.S.C. 580d note; Public Law 107–63) is
18 amended—

19 (1) in subsection (b), by striking “40” and in-
20 serting “60”;

21 (2) in subsection (c) by striking “13” and in-
22 serting “25”; and

23 (3) in subsection (d), by striking “2008” and
24 inserting “2009”.

1 SEC. 418. In entering into agreements with foreign
2 countries pursuant to the Wildfire Suppression Assistance
3 Act (42 U.S.C. 1856m) the Secretary of Agriculture and
4 the Secretary of the Interior are authorized to enter into
5 reciprocal agreements in which the individuals furnished
6 under said agreements to provide wildfire services are con-
7 sidered, for purposes of tort liability, employees of the
8 country receiving said services when the individuals are
9 engaged in fire suppression: *Provided*, That the Secretary
10 of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior shall not
11 enter into any agreement under this provision unless the
12 foreign country (either directly or through its fire organi-
13 zation) agrees to assume any and all liability for the acts
14 or omissions of American firefighters engaged in fire-
15 fighting in a foreign country: *Provided further*, That when
16 an agreement is reached for furnishing fire fighting serv-
17 ices, the only remedies for acts or omissions committed
18 while fighting fires shall be those provided under the laws
19 of the host country, and those remedies shall be the exclu-
20 sive remedies for any claim arising out of fighting fires
21 in a foreign country: *Provided further*, That neither the
22 sending country nor any legal organization associated with
23 the firefighter shall be subject to any legal action whatso-
24 ever pertaining to or arising out of the firefighter's role
25 in fire suppression.

1 SEC. 419. None of the funds made available in this
2 Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or in-
3 strumentality of the United States Government except
4 pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority pro-
5 vided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

6 SEC. 420. In awarding a Federal contract with funds
7 made available by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture
8 and the Secretary of the Interior (the “Secretaries”) may,
9 in evaluating bids and proposals, give consideration to
10 local contractors who are from, and who provide employ-
11 ment and training for, dislocated and displaced workers
12 in an economically disadvantaged rural community, in-
13 cluding those historically timber-dependent areas that
14 have been affected by reduced timber harvesting on Fed-
15 eral lands and other forest-dependent rural communities
16 isolated from significant alternative employment opportu-
17 nities: *Provided*, That the Secretaries may award con-
18 tracts, grants or cooperative agreements to local non-prof-
19 it entities, Youth Conservation Corps or related partner-
20 ships with State, local or non-profit youth groups, or small
21 or disadvantaged business or micro-business: *Provided fur-*
22 *ther*, That the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement
23 is for forest hazardous fuels reduction, watershed or water
24 quality monitoring or restoration, wildlife or fish popu-
25 lation monitoring, or habitat restoration or management:

1 *Provided further*, That the terms “rural community” and
2 “economically disadvantaged” shall have the same mean-
3 ings as in section 2374 of Public Law 101–624: *Provided*
4 *further*, That the Secretaries shall develop guidance to im-
5 plement this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in
6 this section shall be construed as relieving the Secretaries
7 of any duty under applicable procurement laws, except as
8 provided in this section.

9 SEC. 421. No funds appropriated in this Act for the
10 acquisition of lands or interests in lands may be expended
11 for the filing of declarations of taking or complaints in
12 condemnation without the approval of the House and Sen-
13 ate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That this
14 provision shall not apply to funds appropriated to imple-
15 ment the Everglades National Park Protection and Ex-
16 pansion Act of 1989, or to funds appropriated for Federal
17 assistance to the State of Florida to acquire lands for Ev-
18 erglades restoration purposes.

19 SEC. 422. (a) LIMITATION ON COMPETITIVE
20 SOURCING STUDIES.—

21 (1) Of the funds made available by this or any
22 other Act to the Department of the Interior for fis-
23 cal year 2006, not more than \$3,450,000 may be
24 used by the Secretary of the Interior to initiate or
25 continue competitive sourcing studies in fiscal year

1 2006 for programs, projects, and activities for which
2 funds are appropriated by this Act and such funds
3 shall not be available until the Secretary submits a
4 reprogramming proposal to the Committees on Ap-
5 propriations of the Senate and the House of Rep-
6 resentatives, and such proposal has been processed
7 consistent with the reprogramming guidelines in
8 House Report 108–330.

9 (2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act, not
10 more than \$2,500,000 may be used in fiscal year
11 2006 for competitive sourcing studies and related
12 activities by the Forest Service.

13 (b) COMPETITIVE SOURCING STUDY DEFINED.—In
14 this section, the term “competitive sourcing study” means
15 a study on subjecting work performed by Federal Govern-
16 ment employees or private contractors to public-private
17 competition or on converting the Federal Government em-
18 ployees or the work performed by such employees to pri-
19 vate contractor performance under the Office of Manage-
20 ment and Budget Circular A–76 or any other administra-
21 tive regulation, directive, or policy.

22 (c) COMPETITIVE SOURCING EXEMPTION FOR FOR-
23 EST SERVICE STUDIES CONDUCTED PRIOR TO FISCAL
24 YEAR 2006.—The Forest Service is hereby exempted from
25 implementing the Letter of Obligation and post-competi-

1 tion accountability guidelines where a competitive sourcing
2 study involved 65 or fewer full-time equivalents, the per-
3 formance decision was made in favor of the agency pro-
4 vider; no net savings was achieved by conducting the
5 study, and the study was completed prior to the date of
6 this Act.

7 SEC. 423. Estimated overhead charges, deductions,
8 reserves or holdbacks from programs, projects and activi-
9 ties to support governmentwide, departmental, agency or
10 bureau administrative functions or headquarters, regional
11 or central office operations shall be presented in annual
12 budget justifications. Changes to such estimates shall be
13 presented to the Committees on Appropriations for ap-
14 proval.

15 SEC. 424. None of the funds in this Act or prior Acts
16 making appropriations for the Department of the Interior
17 and Related Agencies may be provided to the managing
18 partners or their agents for the SAFECOM or Disaster
19 Management projects.

20 SEC. 425. (a) IN GENERAL.—An entity that enters
21 into a contract with the United States to operate the Na-
22 tional Recreation Reservation Service (as solicited by the
23 solicitation numbered WO–04–06vm) shall not carry out
24 any duties under the contract using:

1 (1) a contact center located outside the United
2 States; or

3 (2) a reservation agent who does not live in the
4 United States.

5 (b) NO WAIVER.—The Secretary of Agriculture may
6 not waive the requirements of subsection (a).

7 (c) TELECOMMUTING.—A reservation agent who is
8 carrying out duties under the contract described in sub-
9 section (a) may not telecommute from a location outside
10 the United States.

11 (d) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be con-
12 strued to apply to any employee of the entity who is not
13 a reservation agent carrying out the duties under the con-
14 tract described in subsection (a) or who provides manage-
15 rial or support services.

16 SEC. 426. Section 331, of Public Law 106–113, is
17 amended—

18 (1) in part (a) by striking “2005” and inserting
19 “2009”; and

20 (2) in part (b) by striking “2005” and inserting
21 “2009”.

22 SEC. 427. Section 330 of the Department of the Inte-
23 rior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Pub-
24 lic Law 106–291; 114 Stat. 996; 43 U.S.C. 1701 note),
25 is amended—

1 (1) in the first sentence, by striking “2005”
2 and inserting “2008”;

3 (2) in the third sentence, by inserting “, Na-
4 tional Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service,”
5 after “Bureau of Land Management”; and

6 (3) by adding at the end the following new sen-
7 tence: “To facilitate the sharing of resources under
8 the Service First initiative, the Secretaries of the In-
9 terior and Agriculture may make transfers of funds
10 and reimbursement of funds on an annual basis
11 among the land management agencies referred to in
12 this section, except that this authority may not be
13 used to circumvent requirements and limitations im-
14 posed on the use of funds.”.

15 SEC. 428. The Secretary of Agriculture may acquire,
16 by exchange or otherwise, a parcel of real property, includ-
17 ing improvements thereon, of the Inland Valley Develop-
18 ment Agency of San Bernardino, California, or its succes-
19 sors and assigns, generally comprising Building No. 3 and
20 Building No. 4 of the former Defense Finance and Ac-
21 counting Services complex located at the southwest corner
22 of Tippecanoe Avenue and Mill Street in San Bernardino,
23 California, adjacent to the former Norton Air Force Base.
24 As full consideration for the property to be acquired, the
25 Secretary of Agriculture may terminate the leasehold

1 rights of the United States received pursuant to section
2 8121(a)(2) of the Department of Defense Appropriations
3 Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287; 118 Stat. 999). The ac-
4 quisition of the property shall be on such terms and condi-
5 tions as the Secretary of Agriculture considers appropriate
6 and may be carried out without appraisals, environmental
7 or administrative surveys, consultations, analyses, or other
8 considerations of the condition of the property.

9 SEC. 429. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit
10 to the House Committee on Appropriations a report detail-
11 ing the Federal expenditures pursuant to the Southern
12 Nevada Public Lands Management Act (section 4(e)(3) of
13 Public Law 105–263) for fiscal years 2003 and 2004.

14 SEC. 430. None of the funds in this Act may be used
15 to prepare or issue a permit or lease for oil or gas drilling
16 in the Finger Lakes National Forest, New York, during
17 fiscal year 2006.

18 SEC. 431. None of the funds made available in this
19 Act for the Department of the Interior may be used to
20 implement the first proviso under the heading “UNITED
21 STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE-LAND ACQUISI-
22 TION”.

23 SEC. 432. None of the funds made available in this
24 Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No.
25 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice

1 in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) or
2 to delay the implementation of that order.

3 SEC. 433. None of the funds made available in this
4 Act may be used to finalize, issue, implement, or enforce
5 the proposed policy of the Environmental Protection Agen-
6 cy entitled “National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
7 System (NPDES) Permit Requirements for Municipal
8 Wastewater Treatment During Wet Weather Conditions”,
9 dated November 3, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 63042).

10 SEC. 434. None of the funds made available in this
11 Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environ-
12 mental Protection Agency—

13 (1) to accept, consider, or rely on third-party
14 intentional dosing human studies for pesticides; or

15 (2) to conduct intentional dosing human studies
16 for pesticides.

17 SEC. 435. None of the funds made available in this
18 Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attend-
19 ance of more than 50 Federal employees at any single con-
20 ference occurring outside the United States.

21 SEC. 436. None of the funds made available in this
22 Act for the Department of the Interior may be used to
23 enter into or renew any concession contract except a con-
24 cession contract that includes a provision that requires
25 that merchandise for sale at units of the National Park

1 System be made in any State of the United States, the
2 District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,
3 Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or the Com-
4 monwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

5 **SEC. 437. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR SALE OR**
6 **SLAUGHTER OF FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND**
7 **BURROS.**

8 None of the funds made available by this Act may
9 be used for the sale or slaughter of wild free-roaming
10 horses and burros (as defined in Public Law 92–195).

11 This Act may be cited as the “Department of the In-
12 terior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations
13 Act, 2006”.

Passed the House of Representatives May 19, 2005.

Attest:

Clerk.

109TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2361

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

In the Senate of the United States,

June 29, 2005.

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 2361) entitled “An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.”, do pass with the following

AMENDMENT:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

- 1 *That the following sums are appropriated, out of any*
- 2 *money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the*
- 3 *Department of the Interior, environment, and related agen-*
- 4 *cies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for*
- 5 *other purposes, namely:*

1 *at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate*
2 *equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level po-*
3 *sitions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehi-*
4 *cles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase*
5 *of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations*
6 *which issue publications to members only or at a price to*
7 *members lower than to subscribers who are not members;*
8 *construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renova-*
9 *tion of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project; and not*
10 *to exceed \$9,000 for official reception and representation*
11 *expenses, \$2,333,416,000, to remain available until Sep-*
12 *tember 30, 2007, including administrative costs of the*
13 *brownfields program under the Small Business Liability*
14 *Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002.*

15 *OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL*

16 *For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector Gen-*
17 *eral in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General*
18 *Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration,*
19 *repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to*
20 *exceed \$85,000 per project, \$36,955,000, to remain available*
21 *until September 30, 2007.*

22 *BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES*

23 *For construction, repair, improvement, extension, al-*
24 *teration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of,*

1 *or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency,*
2 *\$40,218,000, to remain available until expended.*

3 *HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND*

4 *(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)*

5 *For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive*
6 *Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act*
7 *of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections*
8 *111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and*
9 *for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and ren-*
10 *ovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per project;*
11 *\$1,256,165,000, to remain available until expended, con-*
12 *sisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund*
13 *upon the date of enactment of this Act as authorized by*
14 *section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reau-*
15 *thorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to \$1,256,165,000*
16 *as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Sub-*
17 *stance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section*
18 *517(b) of SARA, as amended: Provided, That funds appro-*
19 *priated under this heading may be allocated to other Fed-*
20 *eral agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of*
21 *CERCLA: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated*
22 *under this heading, \$13,536,000 shall be transferred to the*
23 *“Office of Inspector General” appropriation to remain*
24 *available until September 30, 2007, and \$30,606,000 shall*

1 *be transferred to the “Science and Technology” appropria-*
2 *tion to remain available until September 30, 2007.*

3 *LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM*

4 *For necessary expenses to carry out leaking under-*
5 *ground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section*
6 *205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act*
7 *of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilita-*
8 *tion, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$85,000 per*
9 *project, \$73,027,000, to remain available until expended.*

10 *OIL SPILL RESPONSE*

11 *For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental*
12 *Protection Agency’s responsibilities under the Oil Pollution*
13 *Act of 1990, \$15,863,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill*
14 *Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.*

15 *STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS*

16 *(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)*

17 *For environmental programs and infrastructure as-*
18 *sistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving*
19 *funds and performance partnership grants, \$3,453,550,000,*
20 *to remain available until expended, of which*
21 *\$1,100,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for*
22 *the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of*
23 *the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the*
24 *“Act”); \$850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for*
25 *the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section*

1 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except
2 that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking
3 Water Act, as amended, none of the funds made available
4 under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropria-
5 tions Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for health
6 effects studies on drinking water contaminants; \$50,000,000
7 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design,
8 construction and related activities in connection with the
9 construction of high priority water and wastewater facili-
10 ties in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after
11 consultation with the appropriate border commission;
12 \$40,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to
13 address drinking water and waste infrastructure needs of
14 rural and Alaska Native Villages: Provided, That, of these
15 funds: (1) the State of Alaska shall provide a match of 25
16 percent; (2) no more than 5 percent of the funds may be
17 used for administrative and overhead expenses; and (3) not
18 later than October 1, 2005 the State of Alaska shall make
19 awards consistent with the State-wide priority list estab-
20 lished in 2004 for all water, sewer, waste disposal, and
21 similar projects carried out by the State of Alaska that are
22 funded under section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution
23 Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1301) or the Consolidated Farm and
24 Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) which shall
25 allocate not less than 25 percent of the funds provided for

1 *projects in regional hub communities; \$200,000,000 shall*
2 *be for making grants for the construction of drinking water,*
3 *wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water*
4 *quality protection in accordance with the terms and condi-*
5 *tions specified for such grants in the joint explanatory*
6 *statement of the managers accompanying this Act, and, for*
7 *purposes of these grants, each grantee shall contribute not*
8 *less than 45 percent of the cost of the project unless the*
9 *grantee is approved for a waiver by the Agency;*
10 *\$90,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Com-*
11 *prehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and*
12 *Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including*
13 *grants, interagency agreements, and associated program*
14 *support costs, of which \$200,000 may be made available*
15 *for a brownfields assessment of the Fortuna Radar Site;*
16 *\$1,000,000 for cost-shared grants for school bus retrofit and*
17 *replacement projects that reduce diesel emissions;*
18 *\$1,500,000 may be for the expansion of the wastewater*
19 *treatment plant in Lake Havasu City, Arizona; \$1,000,000*
20 *may be for the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant*
21 *in Avondale, Arizona; and \$1,122,550,000 shall be for*
22 *grants, including associated program support costs, to*
23 *States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal*
24 *consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-*
25 *media or single media pollution prevention, control and*

1 *abatement and related activities, including activities pursu-*
2 *ant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public*
3 *Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of*
4 *the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and*
5 *data collection activities subject to terms and conditions*
6 *specified by the Administrator, of which \$50,000,000 shall*
7 *be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended,*
8 *\$19,344,000 shall be for Environmental Information Ex-*
9 *change Network grants, including associated program sup-*
10 *port costs, and \$16,856,000 shall be for making competitive*
11 *targeted watershed grants: Provided further, That for fiscal*
12 *year 2006, State authority under section 302(a) of Public*
13 *Law 104–182 shall remain in effect: Provided further, That*
14 *notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pol-*
15 *lution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State*
16 *water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by*
17 *a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts*
18 *included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal*
19 *year 2005 and prior years where such amounts represent*
20 *costs of administering the fund to the extent that such*
21 *amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Adminis-*
22 *trator, accounted for separately from other assets in the*
23 *fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including*
24 *administration: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2006,*
25 *and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Adminis-*

1 *trator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for*
2 *any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants*
3 *to Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of*
4 *that Act: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2006, not-*
5 *withstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(e)*
6 *of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appro-*
7 *priated for State Revolving Funds under title VI of that*
8 *Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under*
9 *section 518(c) of that Act: Provided further, That no funds*
10 *provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater*
11 *and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in*
12 *the United States along the United States-Mexico border*
13 *shall be made available to a county or municipal govern-*
14 *ment unless that government has established an enforceable*
15 *local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that*
16 *jurisdiction the development or construction of any addi-*
17 *tional colonia areas, or the development within an existing*
18 *colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other*
19 *structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary*
20 *infrastructure: Provided further, That, notwithstanding*
21 *any other provision of law, heretofore and hereafter, after*
22 *consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Ap-*
23 *propriations and for the purpose of making technical cor-*
24 *rections, the Administrator is authorized to award grants*
25 *under this heading to entities and for purposes other than*

1 *those listed in the joint explanatory statements of the man-*
2 *agers accompanying the Agency's appropriations Acts for*
3 *the construction of drinking water, wastewater and*
4 *stormwater infrastructure and for water quality protection:*
5 *Provided further, That from unobligated prior year funds*
6 *in appropriation accounts available to the Environmental*
7 *Protection Agency, \$58,000,000 is hereby rescinded: Pro-*
8 *vided further, That such rescissions shall be taken solely*
9 *from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and inter-*
10 *agency agreements whose availability under the original pe-*
11 *riod for obligation for such grant, contract, or interagency*
12 *agreement has expired.*

13 *ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS*

14 *For fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C.*
15 *6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environ-*
16 *mental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's*
17 *function to implement directly Federal environmental pro-*
18 *grams required or authorized by law in the absence of an*
19 *acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agree-*
20 *ments to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal*
21 *consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist*
22 *the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental*
23 *programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law,*
24 *except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded*

1 *from funds designated for State financial assistance agree-*
2 *ments.*

3 *The Administrator of the Environmental Protection*
4 *Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide reg-*
5 *istration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the*
6 *Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as*
7 *added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration Im-*
8 *provement Act of 2003), as amended.*

9 *Notwithstanding section 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV) of the*
10 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation,*
11 *and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV)),*
12 *beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, appropriated*
13 *funds may be used to award grants or loans under section*
14 *104(k) of CERCLA to eligible entities that satisfy all of the*
15 *elements set forth in CERCLA section 101(40) to qualify*
16 *as a bona fide prospective purchaser except that the date*
17 *of acquisition of the property was prior to the date of enact-*
18 *ment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield*
19 *Revitalization Act of 2001.*

20 *For fiscal years 2006 through 2011, the Administrator*
21 *may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel Man-*
22 *agement, make not to exceed five appointments in any fiscal*
23 *year under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209 for the*
24 *Office of Research and Development.*

1 *Beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, and not-*
2 *withstanding section 306 of the Toxic Substances Control*
3 *Act, the Federal share of the cost of radon program activi-*
4 *ties implemented with Federal assistance under section 306*
5 *shall not exceed 60 percent in the third and subsequent*
6 *grant years.*

7 *None of the funds provided in this Act or any other*
8 *Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency*
9 *(EPA) to publish proposed or final regulations pursuant*
10 *to the requirements of section 428(b) of Division G of Public*
11 *Law 108–199 until the Administrator of the Environmental*
12 *Protection Agency, in coordination with other appropriate*
13 *Federal agencies, has completed and published a technical*
14 *study to look at safety issues, including the risk of fire and*
15 *burn to consumers in use, associated with compliance with*
16 *the regulations. Not later than six months after the date*
17 *of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall complete*
18 *and publish the technical study.*

19 *Beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, notwith-*
20 *standing any other provision of law, recipients of grants*
21 *provided under section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Envi-*
22 *ronmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of*
23 *1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) may use the grant funds for rea-*
24 *sonable administrative expenses, as determined by the Ad-*
25 *ministrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.*

1 *SEC. 201. (a) The Administrator of the Environmental*
2 *Protection Agency shall conduct a thorough review of all*
3 *third-party intentional human dosing studies to identify or*
4 *quantify toxic effects currently submitted to the Agency*
5 *under FIFRA to ensure that they:*

6 (1) *address a clearly defined regulatory objective;*

7 (2) *address a critical regulatory endpoint by en-*
8 *hancing the Agency's scientific data bases;*

9 (3) *were designed and being conducted in a*
10 *manner that ensured the study was adequate scientif-*
11 *ically to answer the question and ensured the safety*
12 *of volunteers;*

13 (4) *was designed to produce societal benefits that*
14 *outweigh any anticipated risks to participants;*

15 (5) *adhered to all recognized ethical standards*
16 *and procedures in place at the time the study was*
17 *conducted; and*

18 (6) *are consistent with section 12(a)(2)(P) of the*
19 *Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act*
20 *and all other applicable laws.*

21 (b) *The Administrator shall, within 60 days of the en-*
22 *actment of this Act, report to the House and Senate Com-*
23 *mittees on Appropriations; the Senate Committee on Agri-*
24 *culture, Nutrition and Forestry; and the House Committee*
25 *on Agriculture on the results of the review required under*

1 subsection (a) and any actions taken pursuant to the re-
2 view.

3 (c) Within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, the
4 Administrator shall issue a final rule that addresses apply-
5 ing ethical standards to third-party studies involving inten-
6 tional human dosing to identify or quantify toxic effects.

7 SEC. 202. None of the funds made available in this
8 Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental
9 Protection Agency—

10 (1) to accept, consider, or rely on third-party in-
11 tentional dosing human studies for pesticides; or

12 (2) to conduct intentional dosing human studies
13 for pesticides.

14 *TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES*

15 *DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE*

16 *FOREST SERVICE*

17 *FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH*

18 *For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland re-*
19 *search as authorized by law, \$280,892,000, to remain avail-*
20 *able until expended: Provided, That of the funds provided,*
21 *\$58,434,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis pro-*
22 *gram.*

23 *STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY*

24 *For necessary expenses of cooperating with and pro-*
25 *viding technical and financial assistance to States, terri-*
26 *ories, possessions, and others, and for forest health manage-*

Selected Amendments Proposed on the House Floor

<u>Page</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Subject</u>
		<u>Legislative Amendments</u>
H3665	Stupak/Shaw	Amendment on Blending: The amendment was accepted by Mr. Taylor and passed by voice vote. Only Mr. Duncan from TN spoke against the amendment. All speakers, including Mr. Taylor, emphasized that the amendment made no change to existing EPA policy and practice. Mr. Stupak and Mr. Taylor entered into a colloquy which clarified that all permits and EPA regions must continue to comply with the CWA, which they said allows blending in wet weather events. A number of members made reference to the Agency's May 19 th letter on this subject. Although the proponents were pleased that the Agency stated it would not implement the draft policy, they felt passing the amendment would leave no ambiguity and would prohibit changes to the Agency's position as stated in the letter.
H3663	Hastings	Amendment on Environmental Justice: Prohibits funds to be used to "contravene" Ex Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice to Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) or delay implementation of the order. Mr. Taylor accepted the amendment, which passed on voice vote.
H3670	Solis	Amendment on Human Studies: Prohibits funds to be used to accept, consider or rely on third-party intentional dosing human studies for pesticides or to conduct said studies. Ms. Solis argued that EPA has all the data it needs without relying on human testing and cited a 2002 quote from Administrator Johnson on this subject. Mr. Taylor accepted the amendment, which passed on voice vote.
H3643	Gillmor	Amendment on STAG Special Projects: The provision proposed by the Committee to authorize technical fixes to the Special Projects was amended to delete future authority and to clarify it applies only to those projects incorporated by reference into the Bill. The amendment was accepted by voice vote.
H3669	Tiaht	Amendment on review of Science: This amendment was

withdrawn as it would have been subject to a point of order. The amendment would have prohibited the promulgation of regulations unless the science used to develop the regulation had been peer reviewed by an “outside audit”. Mr. Tiahrt sited the Agency’s TRI lead as an example of a burden to small business and characterized it as a rule that would have benefited from such an audit.

Successful Funding Amendments

H3640 Grijalva Amendment on Environmental Justice: The House accepted, by voice vote, this amendment to increase EJ by \$1.9 million. We expect his full statement to indicate that the reduction will come from Regulatory Innovation.

H3643 Johnson Amendment on Brownfields: Increases Brownfields Revolving Fund by \$2 Million with the offset from the Brownfields Categorical Grant. The Committee had originally recommended \$52 Million for the Categorical Grant, which is \$2 million more than authorized. The amendment was accepted by voice vote.

Failed Funding Amendments

H3638 Terry Amendment to Increase Superfund: Would have increased Superfund by \$130 Million, with the offset coming from the Agency’s S&T account. The Amendment was rejected by a vote of 76 yeas to 344 nays.

H3640 Obey Amendment to Increase Clean Water SRF: His first amendment, to add \$500 Million by reducing the tax cut, was struck down on a point of order. His second amendment, to add \$100 Million, by reducing the funds set aside for STAG special projects, was defeated by a vote of 186 yeas to 235 nays.

H3623 Hefley Amendment to cut 1% in Bill: This amendment, which he offers to many appropriations bills, would have cut 1% of the total appropriated funds in the bill, or \$261 Million, and would have allowed the President to decide where to take the reductions. It failed by a vote of 90 yeas to 326 nays.

Points of Order

H3640 Gillmor Points of order sustained: These points of order alleged the inclusion of authorizations in an appropriations bill.

Under House rules, an appropriations bill cannot also include authorizations.

- Drinking Water SRF set-aside for Health Effects Study: The provision to prohibit this set-aside was deleted.
- School Bus Retrofit Grants: The provision to provide \$10 Million was maintained, although authorizing language was deleted.
- CW/DW SRF transfer: Authority was deleted, even though it has been included in our funding bill for years.

Colloquies

H3619	Sweeney, Hinchey, Taylor	Colloquy: Hudson River NAS Study: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Hinchey and Mr. Taylor entered into a colloquy to discuss the NAS study called for in the Committee's Report. Mr. Hinchey asked about the impact of the Committee Report Language. Mr. Taylor assured him that the language was not intended to delay, stop or disrupt the clean up and would not affect either Phase 1 or Phase II of that clean up. Mr. Taylor agreed to modify the language in Conference to clarify this point.
H3624	Sweeney	Colloquy: Hudson River Dredging Impact to Ft. Edwards: Mr. Sweeney underscored his support for the Report Language that encourages EPA to assist communities in the area so that the impact of the dredging is minimized.

Sources: Charles E. Johnson, EPA CFO, memo to EPA Administrator Stephen L. Johnson; Congressional Record

Selected Amendments Proposed on the Senate Floor

<u>Page</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Subject</u>
S7552	Burns	After a lengthy debate, the Senate passed by a vote of 57 yeas to 40 nays, the Burns amendment. It requires EPA to review, against six specific criteria, all currently submitted third-party intentional dosing studies to identify or quantify toxic effects and to report to Congress on the results of that review. It also requires the Agency to issue a final rule within 180 days of enactment of the appropriations bill.
S7560	Boxer	Once having voted in the affirmative on the Burns amendment, the Senate turned to a vote on the Boxer amendment, which it also passed by a vote of 60 yeas to 37 nays. Senator Boxer's amendment, which is identical to language added to our funding measure by the Full House, prohibits the Agency from accepting, considering, relying or conducting such studies. With these votes, both amendments will be included in the Senate passed version of this bill. During Conference, the Senate and House Conferees will have to reconcile or otherwise resolve the status of the two amendments.
	Reed	Senators Burns and Dorgan, floor managers of the bill, accepted by unanimous consent two technical fixes to the Brownfields program. The first makes permanent the change to the "Date of Purchase" provision in the original authorization. The second allows recipients to use grants for reasonable administrative expenses.
S7511	Obama	Senators Burns and Dorgan, floor managers of the bill, accepted by unanimous consent Senator Obama's amendment to prohibit use of funds to contravene the section of the law that calls for a rule on lead-based paint. He withdrew his other amendment which would have earmarked \$100,000 in EPM to complete the rule.
S7418	Inhofe	Senator Inhofe withdrew this amendment that would have mandated the Agency compete all grants to national, non-profit organizations that represent the interests of state and tribal and local governments.
S7480	Durbin	Senators Burns and Dorgan, floor managers of the bill, accepted by unanimous consent the amendment which

prohibits the Agency from contravening, or delaying implementation of, the February 11, 1994 Ex. Order on Environmental Justice. The amendment is very similar to that accepted during House debate, with the addition of the restriction on delaying implementation.

S7480	Conrad	Senators Burns and Dorgan, floor managers of the bill, accepted by unanimous consent this amendment which earmarks \$200,000 for the Fortuna Radar Site in North Dakota. The funds will come from the \$90 Million appropriated in STAG for Brownfields infrastructure.
S7584	Kyl	Senator Kyl withdrew his amendment that would have changed the state allocation formula for the Clean Water SRF to give Arizona a larger percentage. In withdrawing the amendment, he recognized that this was an issue for the authorizing committee and agreed to work through them. Senators Burns and Dorgan, floor managers of the bill, accepted by unanimous consent Senator Kyl's other amendment which provides \$2.5 million for two additional STAG special projects in Arizona.
S7494	Coburn	Senator Coburn offered an amendment that would require all earmarks, funding directives and funding limitations included in either the House or Senate Appropriations Committee Reports to be included in the Conference Report. Senator Burns argued that the majority of them already are included in the report. The amendment failed by a vote of 33 yeas to 59 nays.
	<u>Colloquies</u>	
	Burns/Inhofe	Inhofe criticized the way the EPA awards discretionary grants, saying there was a lack of competition, accountability, and results. Presented an amendment that would require open competition in discretionary awards. With a commitment from Senator Burns, Senator Inhofe withdrew the amendment.
	Smith/Wyden	The earmark for Winchester, Oregon, should be for Winchester Bay , Oregon. The managers agree that the clerk will correct the clerical error.

Sources: Charles E. Johnson, EPA CFO, memo to EPA Administrator Stephen L. Johnson; Congressional Record

Note: The amendments are listed briefly at S7477 and in long form at S7411.

House Debate on the Conference Report

<u>Page</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Subject</u>
H7018	Dicks	Congratulates Ms. Solis on her leadership of the committee, now that it has jurisdiction over the EPA. Refers briefly to an amendment that will protect children and pregnant mothers and bring better standards to the EPA.
H7018	Solis	Thanks the Congress for passing the amendment banning testing of pesticides on humans.
H7021	Dingell	Attacks the bill as "gut[ting] some of our most important environmental programs." Criticizes cuts to the Clean Water SRF, in particular.
H7021	Etheridge	Hesitantly supporting the bill, but notes with disapproval that it cut \$800 million from EPA natural resources, \$107 million from STAG, \$200 million from SRF clean water, and \$30 million from state grants for conservation and recreation.
H7022	Holt	Disappointed that the Land and Water Conservation Fund received only \$30 million. Also notes large cuts to Clean Water SRF.
H7022	Greene	Supports the EPA funding levels but disappointed that the subcommittee did not include a project he requested to assess risks of air toxics in Houston.
H7022	Woolsey	Notes briefly that he will support the bill for its important veterans' assistance provisions, but compared the bill to a pig with respect to its treatment of environmental programs.

Senate Debate on the Conference Report

<u>Page</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Subject</u>
S9368	Obama	Thanked the Senate for including an amendment stopping EPA from further delaying the implementation of lead paint regulations. The Senator had his letter to EPA Administrator Stephen Johnson on the issue reproduced in the Congressional Reports.
S9369	Jeffords	Approves of the important spending on veterans but criticized the bill for environmental cuts, particularly the large cuts in the Clean Water SRF.